MESSIANIC PROPHECY VINDICATED

G. C. WORKMAN, M.A., PH.D.

RB303320

Presented to the
LIBRARIES *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by

Ronald Peters

MESSIANIC PROPHECY VINDICATED;

OR,

AN EXPLANATION AND DEFENCE OF THE ETHICAL THEORY.

BY

GEORGE COULSON WORKMAN, M.A., PH.D.,

AUTHOR OF "THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH," "THE OLD TESTAMENT VINDICATED," ETC.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

TORONTO.

1899.

ENTERED according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, by GEORGE COULSON WORKMAN, at the Department of Agriculture.

PREFACE.

THE substance of these pages was read to the Committee of the Bay of Quinte Conference which met at Belleville, Ontario, on the seventeenth and eighteenth of last month. Since discussing the question with the Committee, I have compressed some parts of the address into a smaller compass, and expanded some other parts of it which seemed to need elucidation.

My object in publishing the address in the form of a book is twofold: first, to vindicate my teaching; and secondly, to get it understood by the Church. Hence, in order to make it more readable, I have simplified the style of the discussion; and, in order to make it more instructive, I have shown wherein the critical view of the subject differs from the traditional view.

The theory of Messianic prophecy which I present is called the Ethical Theory, because the word ethical has a broader meaning than either of the words moral and spiritual. Inasmuch as the poetic and historic principles, no less than the moral and spiritual principles, of the Old Testament are sometimes applied in the New Testament by Christ and his apostles, I think it preferable to use the more comprehensive term.

According to my lecture, of which this book gives

an epitome, the testimony of prophecy to Jesus is that of truths rather than types, of principles rather than predictions. While the typical and predictive element in the Hebrew Scriptures must not be disregarded, it is the moral truths and spiritual principles in them that bear direct witness to him and find divine fulfilment in him.

With this explanation, I send the volume forth, believing that all who study it will acknowledge that my view heightens and dignifies the value of the Old Testament, by showing the inner spiritual harmony between the testimony of prophecy and the teaching of Christ.

G. C. Workman.

Toronto, May 26th, 1899.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY VINDICATED.

I.

HISTORY OF THE CASE.

THERE seems to be a misconception in some quarters as to the nature and purpose of this investigation. Since the meeting of this Committee was first announced in the *Christian Guardian*, three letters, expressing disapproval of it, have appeared in our Church paper. Rev. Dr. Shaw, of Montreal, demurs to the holding of an investigation; Rev. Dr. Gardiner, of Belleville, challenges the action of my Conference; Rev. J. E. Lanceley, of Toronto, laughs at the appointment of "this new court."

The first two ministers characterize the procedure proposed by the resolution of my Conference as "extra-judicial." With all respect to these honored brethren, I must say that they have either misread the resolution or misinterpreted its object. This is not a trial, but an investigation; and a similar course of procedure is adopted by Synods or Conferences in every branch of the Christian Church. Within the past twelve months, Professor Beet, of Wesley College, London, and Professor McGiffert, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, have each had an examination of his teaching similar to that which the Committee now in session has been asked to make of mine. Hence this investigation is held, not to torture

or to whitewash me, as Dr. Gardiner suggests, but to vindicate me, if I can show my teaching to be sound.

For nearly nine years I have been regarded by many people throughout our country as an unsound teacher. Owing to misconception and misrepresentation, I was first denounced as a heretic; and then, because of an attempt to remove me from the Theological Faculty of Victoria University, I was compelled seven years ago last January to resign my position as an instructor in Victoria College. Before tendering my resignation, I asked the members of the Board of Regents to have my views of Scripture examined by a committee of competent scholars, but they paid no attention to my request. From that time to this I have considered myself unfairly treated by those responsible for my enforced retirement from professorial work. The men who condemned me before hearing me, and who prejudiced the country against me before trying to understand me, should, it seems to me, have shown my views of Scripture to be false, or have given me an opportunity to prove them to be true.

At the annual meeting of the Board last May, as help was needed in the subjects of my department, an effort was made by the Chancellor and others to have me restored to my work; but my reinstatement was opposed on the ground that the people of our Church object to my teaching, and that, if I were in the College, they would refuse to support the institution. The day on which the Board met, one of the Regents said to me that there ought to be an investigation; and the same gentleman made a similar suggestion at the meeting, I believe. I reminded him that I had asked for one in my last communication to the Board, nearly seven years before. A few days after this meeting was held, another Regent was prompted to write me a letter on the subject. "I have been think-

ing over your case since I returned home," he wrote, "and it begins to look to me as if you were at a point in this controversy where you ought to ask for an investigation. You were practically condemned without trial, or any proper or adequate investigation of your case; and the whole Methodist people were called on, through the *Guardian*, to place you among modern sceptics, and leave you there."

As the Regents still declined to do what I have thought they should have long since done, namely, give me my work or grant me an investigation, I then decided, on the advice of friends both on and off the Board, to appeal to my brethren in the Bay of Quinte Conference. At my own request, therefore, with a view of obtaining an impartial hearing of my case, the present Committee was appointed to investigate the questions that have been raised as to the character of my teaching.

Before taking up these questions, I purpose giving a short account of the events which led to my resignation, because the history of the controversy has an important bearing on the nature of the injustice which I have suffered for so many years. In presenting this brief sketch, I shall not impute motives, but simply state facts. The time has come when, in my judgment, the truth should be told and the facts should be known.

At the business meeting of the Theological Union of Victoria University, held in Cobourg, in connection with the closing exercises of the College, in May, 1889, a few weeks after my return from Germany, I was unexpectedly appointed to deliver the annual lecture at the close of the session the following year. Not being present at the time, I knew nothing of my appointment till after the meeting was over; but, having been away from the College and out of the country for several years, I regarded the act of my

brethren as an expression of confidence and consideration, assuming that they desired me to prepare a critical lecture on some Old Testament theme. As they designated no subject, however, I was left to choose one myself.

Owing to the number of my engagements and the nature of my work that year, I had not time to commence the special preparation of my paper till about the middle of the following winter, or towards the beginning of the following spring; but, for months before I definitely decided what to discuss, I had been revolving in my mind a couple of appropriate subjects, namely, "Biblical Criticism" and "Messianic Prophecy." Though each of these subjects was congenial to my thought, as well as suitable for the occasion, the latter gradually took possession of me, so that, as the winter wore away and the time to write drew near, I could not rid myself of the conviction that I ought to lecture on it; and, notwithstanding all that I have suffered and lost in consequence, I have no more doubt that I was right in yielding to that conviction than I have that I was right in yielding to the conviction, when I was a student at College, that I ought to enter the ministry of the Methodist Church.

Several considerations influenced me in choosing this subject. In the first place, it was one of great significance in Biblical Theology; in the second place, it was one of peculiar difficulty to Old Testament interpreters; in the third place, it was one of special interest to Christian students; in the fourth place, it was one to which I had given much thought and on which I had something important to say.

Here I wish to repeat what I told the members of the Toronto Conference just nine years ago, namely that my post-graduate course at a German university had nothing whatever to do with my view of Messianic prophecy, or with my treatment of the theme. For a

couple of years before going to study abroad, I taught Hebrew in Victoria College, and each year, when lecturing on the Psalms, I tried, as best I could, to show my students the historic meaning in each case; so that, as a result of my previous reading, I went to Europe in the summer of 1884 with a deep interest in the question of Old Testament prophecy, and a strong desire to investigate it. During my residence in Germany, I never read a book or heard a lecture on the subject; but, while attending Leipzig University, my critical study of the prophets, especially the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, not only led me to examine the chief Messianic passages with considerable thoroughness and helped me to mature my view of their true teaching, but also convinced me that a new discussion of Messianic prophecy was greatly needed by the Christian Church.

In this connection, I wish to mention another fact. The first fall I was in Leipzig, as the students were assembling for the opening of the University, the leading workers connected with the American church in that city desired to form three adult classes for the study of the Bible each Sunday afternoon during the session; and, having heard that I was there on leave of absence as an Old Testament instructor, they requested me to take the class for men. Because of the condition of my health that fall, I hesitated at first to accept the position, knowing that it meant the expenditure of not a little energy; but they insisted so strongly on the duty of my undertaking the work that I yielded at length to their request. On meeting the members of the class, several of whom have since become College professors, I asked them what part of Scripture they would like me to study with them; but they preferred to let me decide that matter myself. Then I suggested that we should take our lessons from the Book of Psalms, telling them that I was

particularly fond of reading portions of it for devotional purposes, and that I thought we ought to study something that would quicken our spirits, as well as stimulate our intellects; and, that we might have a plan in the selection of our lessons, I proposed that we should examine together the so-called Messianic Psalms, in order to see how far, or in what sense, they are really Messianic. So we began the examination of these Psalms in the autumn of 1884, and continued our studies till the summer of 1885. Thus, for a number of years previous to the writing of my lecture, I had been not only maturing, but also teaching, my view of Messianic prophecy both at home and abroad.

As the conviction that I ought to lecture on the subject deepened, knowing that the historic meaning of many passages is quite different from the traditional interpretation of them, I consulted with Chancellor Burwash and Rev. James Allen, M.A., who was then the pastor of the College church in Cobourg, as to the timeliness of such a lecture, telling them what I thought of doing, and asking them if they believed the Church was ready for a critical discussion of Old Testament prophecy. The discussion being one that concerned the scientific interpretation of the Scriptures, not the doctrinal teaching of the Church, they both advised me to prepare my paper, as they considered the subject most appropriate.

I mention this matter now, because some of my best friends have blamed me for giving such a lecture so soon after my return from Germany. I would have acted more wisely, they have said, if I had waited for a few years. Had I known that my paper would be misinterpreted and that I would be maligned for writing it, I would have waited for a while, of course; but I never dreamed that I would be misjudged, or that my teaching would be misrepresented. I sup-

posed that my brethren would regard me as an honest man, and that they would read my essay with an open mind. I did nothing rash or inconsiderate. I chose my subject deliberately, I wrote my lecture prayerfully, I read my paper reverently, I revised it carefully, I published it modestly, in the firm belief that all who studied it would recognize the integrity of my purpose; for I never did anything in my life with a purer desire to combat scepticism and to help the cause of Christ. Hence, having acted cautiously as a loyal Methodist, and conscientiously as an earnest Christian, I have never regretted what I did. It did not occur to me that I should be abused and vilified for trying to get the central subject of the Bible more perfectly understood; so that, if I had it all again to do, with the light I then had, I would do it all again.

On the 12th of May, 1890, I delivered the lecture for the first time to an attentive audience in the Jackson Hall of the old Victoria College; but, owing to a wrong meaning that was taken from it by certain persons present at the meeting, and to an imperfect report of it that was printed in the newspapers the next day, prejudice was created against me in the minds of many of my brethren. In the course of a few weeks, as our Conference was holding its sessions at Cobourg, I was startled one morning, on opening my Toronto paper, to find a resolution from the Guelph Conference, then meeting in Guelph, characterizing my views of Scripture as strongly rationalistic, accusing me of teaching that there is no Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament and that the prophets did not possess the gift of prophecy, *except in the sense of foretelling present facts*, and requesting the College authorities to take action in the matter, in order to protect our students from teaching that is contrary to the doctrinal standards of our Church.

On a question of privilege, I obtained permission, as soon as I could, to address the members of my Conference in regard to this strange resolution, telling them that its allegations were false and its representations ridiculous, assuring them that I had taught nothing un-Methodistic or unevangelical, and asking them if it was fair of my Western brethren to condemn a man before hearing him; for, at that time, not a single member of the Conference that condemned me had, to my knowledge, heard my lecture. After listening to my address, the Conference adopted a kindly-worded resolution, expressing great satisfaction with my statement, deep regret at the action of the Guelph Conference, and full confidence in my integrity and evangelical orthodoxy.

The following Saturday I came, by the request of the local branch of the Theological Union, to repeat my lecture before the members of the Toronto Conference, which was then meeting in the Elm Street church; but such was the prejudice that had been created by false rumors and misleading reports that, after I reached the church and the hour appointed for the lecture arrived, an attempt was made to keep it from being delivered, and a motion was carried, postponing its delivery for a couple of days; so that, when I was permitted to give the lecture, the opposition was so great that I was frequently interrupted; and, when I had finished reading it, some members of the Conference prevented the audience from giving me a vote of thanks. The report of that meeting, especially the account of the refusal of my brethren to allow me to receive a vote of thanks, produced a most unfavorable impression in the minds of Christian people in all parts of this country, an impression that has injured me in the estimation of many ever since.

That summer, after taking a short rest, I spent the time expanding my lecture and preparing it for the

press. I was not obliged to publish it at once, and I had a good excuse for delaying its publication, because of my lame arm and my infirm health; but I knew that some members of the Theological Union desired to have it published as soon as possible, and I believed that a careful perusal of it would remove prejudice. So, assuming that it needed only to be understood to be appreciated, I went to work with an amanuensis, and got it ready for the October number of the *Methodist Quarterly* that fall. Then commenced a storm of criticism which was as unexpected as it was unpleasant, and which has continued in one quarter or another ever since.

In the first week of May, 1891, after twelve months of controversy, the Board of Regents met in Toronto to review the work of the session. At that meeting my case came up for consideration; and, after much discussion, the Board directed the Secretary to request me by telegram to come to Toronto at once, as they wished me to explain some parts of my lecture. I came, as requested, and accompanied the Chancellor to the Board meeting the next morning, when the Chairman introduced me to the Regents, and read a long list of objectionable passages which they wished me to explain. I then addressed them for nearly three full hours, and not only explained every passage criticised, but also answered every question asked. After the meeting adjourned, official brethren came to thank me for my address, and even to compliment me on the character of my defence. Most of those who heard me admitted that they had misinterpreted my lecture, and seemed to be quite satisfied with my explanation; so I expected no more embarrassment over the matter. I supposed that the governing body of the University would help me to allay the excitement that had been created, by correcting the false reports about my lecture that had been circulated

during a year of controversy, but in this supposition I was terribly disappointed.

On the evening of that day, the Board met again for the purpose, amongst other things, of taking action in my case. As everything seemed to be satisfactory, I intended to return to Cobourg immediately; but, at the request of the Chancellor, I decided to remain over till the morning, because he thought the Board might wish to question me still further on the subject. So I came to the Wesley Buildings, and waited in one of the offices till about ten o'clock, when, on the adjournment of the meeting, I learned, to my astonishment, that the Board had adopted a resolution to transfer me from the faculty of Theology to the faculty of Arts, and to commit my exegetical work to Chancellor Burwash. When this decision was made known to me, I could scarcely believe it. After the expressions of approval and appreciation which my explanation had elicited, such a resolution astounded me. I could not understand what they meant by resolving to transfer me from one faculty to another, when I was already a member of both faculties. So I told each of the Regents whom I met that I could not entertain the proposal for one moment, as it was a temporizing and stultifying arrangement.

As the Board was to meet again on the fifteenth of the next month, the day on which the corner-stone of the new Victoria College was laid in the Queen's Park, Toronto, I sent the Regents the following respectful letter:—

"COBOURG, June 12th, 1891.

"*To the Board of Regents of Victoria University:*

"GENTLEMEN,—When, in deference to a courteous request from the Chancellor of the University, pursuant to a resolution by your honorable body, I met

the members assembled in Toronto, on the 8th of last month, for the purpose of giving them some needed information respecting my views on 'Messianic Prophecy,' I met them, as requested, in good faith, believing that the removal of certain misconceptions concerning the true character of my teaching was all that was expected or desired of me. Having carefully explained my treatment of the subject, and having thoroughly answered the objections urged against it by some who took exception to my discussion, I was assured by different members present at the meeting that my explanation was exceedingly satisfactory.

"After the assurances, direct as well as indirect, that I received respecting my defence, I was surprised to learn that evening that the Board had adopted a resolution proposing to transfer me from the faculty of Theology to the faculty of Arts. Having been a member of each faculty since the time that I received my appointment as a professor in the University, I find a difficulty in understanding the meaning of the resolution, as I cannot see how I can be transferred to a position which I already hold. If I had been officially informed in time of this peculiar proposal, I certainly should have promptly endeavored to prevent it from being either passed or published.

"Difficult as it is to understand the meaning of the resolution, it is, if possible, still more difficult for me to understand its purpose. So far as I am capable, though, of comprehending it, the proposal means not a mere transference from one faculty to another, but a complete removal from one faculty. The action of the Board, therefore, implies to me the one or the other of two things. Either it is a condemnation of my teaching, irrespective of its truth or falsity, without a due consideration of its object, or it is a condescension to a popular clamor, owing to unjustifiable prejudice, as a matter of expediency.

"If by this resolution the Board intended to condemn the subject-matter of my teaching, then in the interest of personal justice, as well as for the maintenance of that intellectual liberty without which the work of a University professor cannot be either efficiently or conscientiously performed, I would humbly claim the privilege of a full investigation of the question, and would also respectfully ask the members of the Board to suspend their judgment until I have had an opportunity of placing before the public a full and explicit exposition of the whole subject, a thing which I purpose doing at the earliest possible date. In that exposition I hope to be able to show that every fundamental truth has been not only sacredly conserved, but also more fully and richly illustrated by that which I believe I find in the facts of divinely inspired Scripture truth.

"If, on the other hand, the action of the Board is taken for the purpose of allaying popular prejudice, then I do not see how I can consistently with Christian principle or Christian honesty accept the position offered me. The work required of me in the faculty of Arts is of such a character that it cannot be properly or adequately taught without involving a consideration of the very questions which the proposal of the Board forbids me to discuss. In justice to myself, as well as to the truth, I cannot undertake to offer to my students the imperfect and incomplete instruction which the course contemplated by your resolution really implies. I must, therefore, earnestly request the Board to reconsider the resolution adopted at its previous meeting in reference to my status in the University. Biblical Criticism and Interpretation is my specialty. For post-graduate study in that department, I was granted leave of absence by your honorable body for nearly five consecutive years. To the work of my personal choice, as well as of my special

qualification, I have not only devoted my energies, but also dedicated my life. In the performance of that work, I have always striven to investigate and expound truth in harmony with the mind of Christ, as well as in recognition of *the divine character and the supreme authority of Scripture.* In this way and with this spirit, I intend to prosecute the work of my department in the future.

"In conclusion, I cannot forbear expressing the reasonable hope that the Board will see its way to remove the disability, as well as the injustice, under which its recent resolution places me. Should this be the case, I scarcely need assure you, gentlemen, of my unqualified conviction that, by your sympathy and coöperation, I shall be able to remove entirely the painful misconceptions which have unfortunately been created in reference to my discussion of Messianic prophecy.

"Trusting that my hope will speedily be realized,

"I am, Gentlemen,

"Yours very respectfully,

"G. C. WORKMAN."

In reply to my letter, I received from the Secretary the following communication:—

"COBOURG, June 18th, 1891.

"*Rev. Dr. Workman, Cobourg, Ont.:*

"MY DEAR DR. WORKMAN,—I enclose a copy of the resolution passed by the Board of Regents in response to your communication which was laid before them. You will see that it virtually suspends for reconsideration the action taken at the May meeting, until you have an opportunity of placing before them and the public a statement and defence of your position.

"Verbally, I intimated that you might be able to do

this by the 1st of October; and it is the understanding that about that date, should you be ready, they will be prepared to reconsider the entire question, when I hope a decision may be arrived at which will be satisfactory to both of us, and which will enable you to enter upon the work of next year, without any cloud which might interfere with your comfort in your work or your influence with your students.

"Yours very sincerely,

"N. BURWASH,

"*Secretary of Board.*"

The Resolution of the Regents reads as follows:—

"That the letter of Dr. Workman be received, and that the Secretary be instructed to reply that the Board will gladly receive any extended communication on the subject under investigation, and that when such communication is made they will be glad to consider with due care its bearing upon his future relation to the University."

This resolution I acknowledged in the following terms:—

"COBOURG, July 1st, 1891.

"*To the Board of Regents of Victoria University:*

"GENTLEMEN,—I desire to thank you very sincerely for the courteous resolution which was passed in reply to my recent letter to you, and which was forwarded to me at once by the Chancellor of the University.

"By or before the first of October, I hope to have my statement ready for presentation to you and to the public; at which time I trust that your honorable body will be prepared to reconsider the question of my status in the University, as well as to remove the disability under which your previous resolution pro-

poses to place me, by arranging for me to enter upon the work of the approaching session unembarrassed by any restraint which would interfere either with the nature of my work in the lecture-room or with the character of my influence upon the students connected with my classes.

"I am, Gentlemen,

"Yours respectfully,

"G. C. WORKMAN."

With this assurance of justice on the part of the Board, I felt encouraged; and, after resting for a few weeks, I went to work at my "Sequel," and got it ready for the press about the beginning of October. When it was published, I ordered a copy of it to be sent to each member of the Board. As no meeting of the Board was announced when the time for opening the College drew near, I consulted with the Chancellor about my work, telling him that I could not lecture in either faculty until my case was settled. Having to go to Washington to attend the Ecumenical Council of Methodism immediately after the session commenced, he said to me before he started, "I have read your 'Sequel,' and I am perfectly satisfied, and I believe the Board will be." So I resumed my lectures, as usual, in the subjects of each faculty; and, receiving no notice of a meeting of the Regents that fall, I continued my work to the end of the year, having one of the most delightful and satisfactory terms I ever had in the lecture-room.

The Board did not meet to consider my case till the 6th of January, 1892, when I presented, in person, the following communication:—

"*To the Board of Regents of Victoria University:*

"GENTLEMEN,—At a meeting of your honorable body, held in Toronto on the 15th of last June, you authorized the Chancellor of the University to send

me a courteous resolution, which I promptly acknowledged, in which you promised me, as soon as I might have an opportunity of placing before you a public exposition and defence of my theory of Messianic prophecy, to consider gladly and with due care its bearing upon my future relation to the University.

"Having, according to my agreement, prepared and published my explanatory statement, I now respectfully remind you of your promise, at the same time cherishing the hope that, after carefully considering the character of my 'Sequel,' you will be ready not only to reconsider the question of my official status in Victoria College, but also to remove the disability under which your unexpected resolution of last May proposed to place me in relation to my departmental work.

"During the examination of the 'Sequel, as well as of the original article, you will have seen, I trust, that the method I have indicated of studying the Old Testament prophets in the active work of teaching and preaching, and of interpreting their prophecies in the light of the times in which they were delivered, not only invests the prophets themselves with a deeper individual reality, but also imparts to their prophetic utterances a greater spiritual freshness and vitality. In this way, the ancient prophets may be made to live and speak again, with all their characteristic zeal and earnestness, to the men of modern times. In this way, too, I am encouraged by my correspondents to believe, the Hebrew Bible will become practically a new book to the majority of Biblical students.

"In my endeavor to present a scientific exposition of the leading Messianic passages of the Old Testament, I find nothing in the conscientious conclusions I have reached that does not contribute to the development and defence of evangelical truth. Throughout the

whole discussion, I have honestly endeavored, not only to guard everything vital and essential from the assaults of sceptical critics, but also to turn the legitimate results of modern Biblical criticism to the support and confirmation of the doctrine of Christ. Having discovered, as I believe, the principle on which our Lord and his apostles quoted and applied the ancient Hebrew writings, I have illustrated and confirmed my method of interpreting prophetic Scripture by showing that it is entirely in harmony with the principle of interpreting Old Testament prophecy employed by Christ himself.

"Wherever we can find a principle adopted and applied by him, we are warranted in adopting and applying it ourselves. In my opinion, the importance of this position in reference to the interpretation of the Bible can scarcely be over-estimated. When studying and expounding Scripture, I yield to no man in my respect for the infallible authority of Christ; but Christian teachers, it seems to me, should be very careful not to claim, without an express warrant, his supreme authority as deciding questions which the Divine Being has left to be determined by inquiry or research. The mission of Christ was mainly and fundamentally mediatorial; his work was primarily and practically reconciliatory and redemptive. He speaks to us as the way, the truth, and the life of men, declaring to us, with divine authority, the things of God pertaining to man's salvation, but consistently leaving all questions of historical or literary criticism, such as the composite authorship of the Pentateuch, and the parabolic or the allegoric character of the Book of Jonah, to be settled by study and investigation, just as the sacred writers of the Old Testament left the great problems of physical and astronomical science to be settled in the same way.

"Instead of saying with some scholars that our

Lord *accommodated* his language to current notions or conceptions, it seems better, because truer, to say that he employed the ordinary forms of human speech, and spoke to men in such a manner as to be readily understood by them. Instead of holding with other scholars that he shared the historic and scientific beliefs of his own times, it seems wiser in every way to hold, because the position appears to be demonstrable, that he expressed no opinion in regard to such beliefs. In scientific exegesis, this fact or probability, at least, possesses great importance. Inasmuch as the argument he used, or the lesson he taught, or the principle he applied, was always truly contained in the Scripture he quoted, it follows that he could consistently quote a familiar passage from the books of the Psalms, or from the books of the Law, without expressing any judgment respecting their authorship; and that he could just as consistently employ a well-known incident, such as his reference to the prophet Jonah, as an illustration for his special typical purpose, without giving, or intending to give, any opinion whatsoever as to whether the narrative in question was allegory or history, poetry or prose.

Regarding our Lord as the absolute or perfect revelation of God to man, I have tried to show that the inspired evangelists and apostles who followed him, teaching in his name, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have one and all derived their authority from him. By this method, I maintain, against all opposition and objection, the normative authority of Scripture as the infallible rule of faith and practice. By this method, too, I try to prove the Christo-centric character of all God-inspired Scripture. In this way my view of Scripture is consistent, not only with the phenomena of apostolic inspiration, but also with the development of religious doctrine and the gradualness of revealed truth. On this account, I hold, as I

have stated in my article, that as all ethical or spiritual teaching in the New Testament looks backward to Christ, so all ethical or spiritual teaching in the Old Testament looks forward to him.

"Before concluding this communication, I wish to make an earnest appeal to the judicial fairness of the members of the Board. I have reason to believe that suspicion has been created and distrust produced in reference to the character of my lecture by the persistent misrepresentations of the editor of the *Christian Guardian.* All through the year, month after month, week after week, there have appeared in the columns of our Connexional organ either open insinuations or covert thrusts respecting the evangelical soundness of my teaching. I humbly appeal, gentlemen, to your sense of justice in this matter. I earnestly ask the protection of the Board from such an unfair interference with my work. I cannot hope to teach the subjects of my department with success or comfort so long as one member of the Board, despite anything that I may say or do, is systematically endeavoring to prejudice the Church and country against me. I ask you, gentlemen, if such a course is fair to the Church, or to the College, or to me.

"From the time the original article appeared in print, the editor has persisted in representing my teaching as 'negative,' as 'destructive,' as 'naturalistic,' and as 'rationalistic,' each of which representations is as false to the fact as it is unfair to me. Not satisfied with thus misrepresenting my teaching, he impugns my motives, and accuses me of being evasive and of playing on words. Even my explanatory statement, which your honorable body desired me to prepare, has already been unfairly attacked in the *Guardian,* and just as unfairly misrepresented. Apart from his apparent ridicule of my 'evangelical orthodoxy,' the editor characterizes my 'Sequel' as a

'labored effort,' and as 'an adroit defence;' and he continues to style my positive and explicit exposition 'negative' teaching. Moreover, in the latter portion of his article, he employs exclamatory language, calculated to produce the impression on the minds of his readers that I am endeavoring to introduce some spurious or dangerous doctrines into the Church.

"I ask you again, gentlemen, is this insinuation fair to me or to my students? I have done nothing in a corner. I have openly given the general principles of my exegetical teaching to the Church; I have publicly proclaimed my honest views of prophetic Scripture to the world. The honored and impartial members of the Board will, I trust, believe me when I solemnly declare that I have taught nothing that is not strictly evangelical, and that I have nothing that is not strictly evangelical to teach. They will also believe me when I say that I teach nothing to my students in the lecture-room that I do not desire my brethren in any part of the Church to know. I am just as jealous of the evangelical soundness of the students of my classes, or of the candidates for our ministry, as are any of my fellow-workers in Victoria College or out of it. Throughout the whole of the unpleasant agitation, I have sought nothing but the glory of God, and the elucidation and defence of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Could I consistently or conscientiously have accepted the position offered to me by the Board, I could, by virtue of my relation to the College, have taught every essential feature of my view of prophetic Scripture in connection with the work of the Arts department. From the first to the fourth year of the course, the work each year in Hebrew is connected with the very question in dispute. But I could not and would not condescend to such an unworthy means of thwarting the wishes of the Board.

If I cannot teach honestly and openly and unrestrainedly in my department, I cannot teach at all. I wish to emphasize this fact. I have no doubtful doctrinal novelties to introduce. If I had, I should not meanly seek to import them covertly into the College. Let me once more assure you, gentlemen, that my teaching, as well as my investigation, has always been conducted in harmony with what I believe to be the mind of Christ, and *in recognition of the Divine character and the supreme authority of Scripture.*

"With the assumptions of radical and extreme critics I have no sympathy whatever. As stoutly as I am capable, both in the lecture-room and out of it, I repudiate the improbable and unproved results of literary or historical criticism when applied to the books of Scripture. Only probable or proved results receive support or countenance from me. While my attitude towards every question of inquiry is truly liberal, my spirit, as well as my practice, is as truly conservative. In my future work in the College, as in my past work I have always been, I shall be honest both with myself and with the Board. I shall faithfully defend every vital evangelical doctrine, and I shall sacredly conserve every essential Christian truth.

"Finally, gentlemen, I cannot forbear expressing the opinion that protracted controversy over the situation would be detrimental to the present prosperity of the College, as well as distasteful and disagreeable to my personal feelings respecting the institution in which I received my academic training, and in which I have hitherto performed my professorial work. I do not desire to hold any position or to discharge any office that would not enable me to labor heartily for the highest interest of the College and for the truest advantage of the Church.

"Hence, if in your deliberate judgment you think my services would be advantageous to the prosperity of my Alma Mater, then I humbly ask you to determine, as soon as practicable, my future relation to the College, and resolve to give me your protection and coöperation; but if in your united wisdom you may believe that, in the existing circumstances, because of widespread suspicion and distrust throughout the Church, my presence in the Faculty would be prejudicial to the welfare of the department that I represent, then I ask you earnestly and honestly to have my teaching carefully investigated by a competent committee of impartial scholars, before any further or final action is taken in the case.

"Regretting the necessity of bringing before you this extended communication, and expressing the firm belief that, if you fully understood the true nature and purpose of my conscientious discussion of the greatest and grandest subject of the Old Testament, if not, indeed, of the whole Bible, you would not hesitate an instant to remove the humiliating disability under which your former resolution proposed to place me,

"I am, Gentlemen,

"Yours respectfully,

"G. C. WORKMAN."

This communication was read to the Regents late in the afternoon, but my request for an investigation was ignored. When the Board came together again in the evening, at the suggestion of Dr. Alexander Sutherland, who said I ought to be present when my case was to be considered, I came with him to the meeting. After a prolonged discussion, during which I was not allowed to correct any of the false statements that were made respecting my teaching (and the number of such statements was large), a resolution,

reaffirming the former action of the Regents, was carried by vote of ten to eight. As the Chairman would not allow the vote to be taken till nearly two o'clock the next morning, two of my friends, owing to the illness of one of them, had about midnight to go home; so that, out of a Board of thirty-five members, only nineteen of whom were present when the voting took place, less than a third of them were permitted *to force my resignation*, because they attempted to remove me from the Theological faculty of the College without a proper trial or a fair investigation; and I had told them before the voting commenced that, if they reaffirmed their former action, they could not take a more offensive way to ask me to resign. Before the vote was taken, too, I assured the Regents that, if my view of prophecy were a matter of speculation or of unimportant doctrine, I would, for the sake of relieving the situation, refrain from teaching it for a time; but, as the question at issue was one of scientific interpretation, and as I had but one Hebrew Bible to interpret, I told them that, in whichever faculty I worked, I should have to teach substantially the same thing. The Scripture has but one meaning, and a true teacher must give that meaning to his students, whether they belong to the faculty of Theology or to the faculty of Arts.

The motion, passed by a small fraction of the Board, proposed to transfer me to the Arts faculty, but the words of the resolution were misleading. These Regents endeavored, not to transfer me to the Arts faculty, but to depose me from the Theological faculty; for I was a member of both faculties at the time, and had been for going on ten years. I could not consent to be deposed by my ministerial brethren (for there were only two laymen who voted against me), when I had taught nothing but divine truth, and when I had as good a standing in the Church as

anyone of them had. To have consented to be deposed would have been to condemn myself before the country and to stultify myself before my students; so, when the offensive resolution was adopted, I tendered my resignation in the following terms:—

"Inasmuch as your resolution implies a condemnation of my teaching without a due consideration or examination of its character, and inasmuch as I cannot conscientiously or consistently relinquish the exegetical work of my department, I must, under the circumstances, regretfully tender you my resignation as a professor in Victoria University."

II.

DEFENCE OF THE TEACHING.

Coming now to my defence, I have to deal first with the adverse criticisms of my lecture, and then with those of my book. As my purpose in presenting this defence is to show the doctrinal soundness of my teaching, and to get it properly understood, I shall avoid everything of a polemic character, as well as everything of the nature of personality.

During the first year of the controversy, Mr. John Carlisle, of Peterborough, wrote to one of the local papers of that place a series of articles that were afterwards issued in the form of a pamphlet, which was circulated throughout the town of Napanee, when our Conference met there eight years ago next June. This pamphlet is entitled "An Exposé of and a Red Hot Protest against *A Damnable Heresy* smuggled into Methodism, and taught by Rev. Professor Workman, of Victoria University, Cobourg, and approved of by Rev. Professor Burwash, Chancellor of said institution, and by the Bay of Quinte Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada." Of this pamphlet, which every Methodist is requested on both cover and title-page to read, I have nothing whatever to say.

From the beginning of 1891 to the end of 1892, Professor Hirschfelder, a former teacher of Hebrew in Toronto University, wrote eight long articles in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly*. These articles were courteously written from the stand-point of a traditional interpreter, but they did not disturb a single

position or disprove a single statement I had made in my lecture; so I need not stop to analyze them. Before dismissing them, however, I may say that I know this writer was officially asked to criticise my view of prophecy, and that I know he was officially asked to stop criticising it. I may also say that I have been acquainted with the venerable old teacher for several years, and that, the first time I met him after he ceased writing for the *Quarterly*, he promptly complimented me on the ability of my lecture, and spontaneously assured me that he did not want to write against me, but he was urged to do it. I mention these things here, because I feel my brethren should know them.

To the *Methodist Magazine* for April, 1891, Principal Caven, of Knox College, wrote, at the request of the editor, a courteous criticism, which was evidently not intended to call forth a reply from me, because the writer does not mention my name in his article, but speaks of my discussion as "the view here referred to," or "the view now presented," etc. On a few points this writer has failed to apprehend my meaning, but in several respects his view of prophecy coincides with mine. He defines the word prophet substantially as I define it, and he agrees with me that prophecy is not history written in advance. "No one is to be blamed for recognizing in prophecy much more than prediction," Dr. Caven says. He agrees with me, too, that the proper conception of the New Testament prophet seems identical, or nearly so, with that of the Old Testament prophet. "If there are persons to whom it sounds strange to use the term prophecy in this wider meaning," he says, "they are only those who have given little attention to the matter, and who are not familiar with the language habitually employed by all schools of interpreters." He admits that "the announcement as to the woman's seed

which shall bruise the serpent's head, may well foreshadow the final victory of the Church, as well as that of the Church's Head;" and he grants that "the prediction in Deuteronomy respecting the prophet who shall be raised up by the Lord, may well promise a succession of true prophets, while its perfect accomplishment is in him who spake by all the prophets." On all these points his article and my lecture are in substantial agreement.

In the *Methodist Magazine* for January, 1891, Dr. Withrow published an editorial which is courteous in tone, but discourteous in statement, for it accuses me of excluding or deleting the doctrine of Messianic prophecy and of Messianic atonement from the Old Testament, and thus of eviscerating the Hebrew Scriptures of their very life and spirit. Being in Toronto shortly after this editorial was published, I called on the writer and showed him how unjust his accusations were, when he promised publicly to repair the damage he had done me by correcting at once what he had said. So, in the course of a week or two, he sent me a letter containing the proof of an article concerning which he wrote, "You will see by the enclosed that I have tried to make the '*amende honorable.*'" The article is entitled "Professor Workman on Messianic Prophecy," and reads as follows:—

"Since the appearance of our short review of Rev. Dr. Workman's article on this subject in the January number of this *Magazine*, we have had the pleasure of a long conference with that gentleman on the topic of his essay. We deem it only due to Professor Workman and to ourself to say, that the frank and full discussion of the subject removed some of the difficulties which we had felt on first reading that essay. Professor Workman speaks with the authority of an expert on the interpretation of Hebrew phrases and idioms. There are few men living who have

devoted more time and thought to the careful study of the august and important subject of his essay than has he. We are free to confess that some of his expositions carry with them very great weight. Professor Workman got down from our book-shelves our Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, and the Revised Version of the Old Testament, and by a careful examination of text and context with the original Hebrew and with Hebrew usages in other passages, showed that the restricted meanings commonly given to certain Hebraic words is not warranted by Old Testament usage.

"The doctrine of Messianic prophecy and of Messianic atonement, Dr. Workman claims, are not 'deleted,' to use the phrase we employed, and that, therefore, the Old Testament is not 'eviscerated of its very life and spirit.' On the contrary, he claims that 'the Hebrew Scriptures are saturated with Messianic prophecy, but in a sense deeper than Christian people commonly suppose. Because of the divine element in prophecy, the Old Testament is full of Christ, not in the sense of prediction, but in the sense of testimony. From Genesis to Malachi, the prophetic Scriptures, in their lofty ethical conceptions, breathe the spirit of Jesus Christ. To him bear all the prophets witness. He is the central or focal point, so to speak, in which all lines of Messianic prophecy converge, not in the predictive, but in the ethical, sense of the term. As all ethical teaching in the New Testament looks backward to Christ, so all ethical teaching in the Old Testament looks forward to him. As the manifested truth of God, he embodies or realizes in his own personality the truths and principles of Messianic prophecy.'

"We are glad to find that the hope which we expressed, that many of the differences of interpretation between Dr. Workman and his critics were differences in mode of expression more than of underlying prin-

ciples, is correct. Dr. Workman claims that his principles of interpretation are identical with those of John Wesley and the great exegetical authorities. 'It is only,' he says, 'when a man has grasped the spiritual significance of Christianity that he can appreciate the presence of the Spirit in all Christian experience, or the agency of the Spirit in every historic age. On this principle Christ dealt with the people in his day in using or applying prophecy. As wise defenders of his Gospel, we should learn to do the same. To the believer prophecy attests a revelation resulting from the influence of the Divine Spirit. To such a person prophecy is not a *credential*, but an *evidence*, of revelation. It furnishes a proof that God has revealed himself to his servants under the old dispensation, which, as has been stated, was preparatory to the new. As Christ was the end of the law, so also, in a significant sense, he was the end of prophecy, to every one that believeth. Christ was the end of prophecy, that is, the prophetic work of Christ was final, in the sense that Christian prophecy is the unfolding and explaining of the truths which he revealed. His prophecy was also final, in the sense that no other revelation will be made to man that will supersede the system of religious truth which constitutes the basis of historic Christianity.'

"Hence our expression, that there are '*vital* points of difference between the views of Dr. Workman, as we understand them, and the great concensus of opinion of all Biblical commentators,' we now deem too strong. How exigent these differences are must be decided by full and fair discussion.

"Professor Workman claims the authority of Delitzsch in support of some of his views as to the 'Deutero-Isaiah.' But that learned author, in his recent commentary on Isaiah, admits that 'much seems to be better explained when chapters xl.-lxvi.

are regarded as testamentary discourses of the one Isaiah, and the entire prophetic collection as the progressive development of his incomparable charism.' 'The critical question,' says Delitzsch, 'is not easily answered, for, however it is answered, obscure points remain which cannot be cleared up. The matter in question is the solving of a problem, not the expounding of a problem beyond all doubt; at least not for us, to whom the naming of Cyrus is not a conclusive disproof of the personal unity of the two Isaiahs.' There is little doubt, however, that Delitzsch did accept cautiously, and with some reserve, the view that, as he expressly states, 'the Book of Isaiah, as it now exists, contains prophetic discourses of Isaiah, and of other later prophets; the later ones being intermixed with his, and designedly combined into one whole.'

"Dr. Clarke is thought somewhat old-fashioned to-day. It is true, nevertheless, he had the reputation in his day of a considerable acquaintance with Oriental languages and literature, and he combats most strenuously some of the interpretations of Dr. Workman. Our present mental attitude is one of suspense on some of these matters till they have been more thoroughly sifted by other much more competent authorities. We shall be anxious to see, in Delitzsch's posthumous work on Messianic prophecy, the critical discussion of the whole subject by a Hebrew scholar whose weight and learning none will admit more readily than Dr. Workman himself."

This article, which I acknowledged to be both fair and fine, was never published, though I have had the proof of it in my possession for upwards of eight years. It was put into the press, and it was taken out of the press; so that the February number of the *Magazine* that year was issued with the title "Messianic Prophecy" on its cover, but with no article on the subject amongst its contents.

Nearly three months later, after two new numbers of the *Magazine* had been issued, I received another proof of this article, increased to nearly twice its original length by quotations from Dr. Gloag and by comments on them from Dr. Withrow; but these quotations and comments imply that I do not admit any reference to a future Messiah in the Old Testament, whereas I distinctly state in my lecture that in Isaiah ix. 2-7, we have an explicit reference to a future Messiah. I also state that we have a similar reference in Isaiah xi. 1-10; Jeremiah xxiii. 5-8; Micah v. 1-4; Zechariah ix. 9; and in my Sequel I have shown that there are nine such passages. As his additional matter was so used as to destroy the value of the original, I wrote Dr. Withrow that I would rather not have the article published at all than to have it published in its expanded form. So what the editor of the *Magazine* was pleased to call his "*amende honorable*" has not, as yet, been given to the world.

But the most serious criticisms of my lecture were made by Dr. Dewart in the *Christian Guardian*, in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly*, and in a book entitled "Jesus the Messiah in Prophecy and Fulfilment." His criticisms are so numerous and mischievous that I shall need to deal with them somewhat at length. Most of them are made, it should be here observed, by disregarding my explicit definitions and distinctions.

In my discussion of prophecy, I define the word *prophet* as a spokesman, one who speaks forth, or one who speaks for another. The English word is derived from two Greek words—*pro*, before, in the sense of before the public, and *phemi*, to speak. This is the only derivation that is sanctioned by the best Greek and English etymologists. Hence, in harmony with Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, which shows

that the idea of prediction is foreign to the original meaning of the word, I say that a prophet is an interpreter, a proclaimer, a forthteller; that is, one who speaks forth publicly, or to the public, a message from God. I discussed the derivation of the word, in order to correct a popular misconception, namely, that a prophet is one who predicts coming events rather than one who proclaims divine truth. Though modern teachers of the school of Keith assume that a prophet was a predictor who possessed the most perfect knowledge of the future, the assumption is uncritical and unscriptural; for, while a prophet occasionally foretold events, the foretelling of events was not the primary, much less the principal, feature of his work. In Old Testament times, the word prophet signified one who announced or declared a divine message, and that message might refer to the past, to the present, or to the future. When my critic, therefore, represents me as teaching that the prophet is simply "a preacher," the representation is not correct. He was a preacher, or a religious teacher, but he was something more than a mere preacher. He was a preacher who was endowed with a measure of predictive power. In my lecture I emphatically assert, "That the prophets sometimes uttered predictions can be demonstrated by specific Scripture passages."

In my discussion, I explain that the word *prophesy* literally signifies to tell or to announce, and that it technically means to speak or to proclaim under the influence of a divine impulse. In order to correct another popular misconception, I distinguished carefully between *prophecy* and *prediction*. The distinction between these two words is of paramount importance, because the former is a much more comprehensive term than the latter. Prediction signifies only to foretell, but prophecy signifies to forthtell, or to tell forth, as well as to foretell. Moreover, I

explain that there are two essential elements in prophecy—the one a moral, the other a predictive, element; but I teach that the moral element is the fundamental and indispensable element, to which the predictive element is everywhere subordinate. In this respect my teaching is in perfect accord with the best modern authorities on the subject. The Imperial Bible Dictionary and McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia both state that "the moral element is the fundamental, to which the predictive is always subsidiary." But my critic, who asserts that "the idea of prediction is essentially imbedded in the word prophecy," which is an unfortunate misconception, and who maintains that "the essential element is predictive," whereas it is only one of the essential elements, and that not the fundamental one, accuses me of "persistent disparagement of the predictive element in prophecy;" but it will be seen, I trust, that I am not disparaging either element in trying to get the true relation of the one to the other rightly understood. In my lecture I teach that neither element must be pressed so as to exclude the other. After discussing the tendency of some writers to disregard entirely the predictive element, and of other writers to emphasize only the moral element, I distinctly state, "The one treatment of prophecy is as prejudiced and partial as the other treatment is one-sided and incomplete."

In my discussion, I observe that certain general features were common to all primitive prophecy, whether Hebrew or heathen. The dream, the vision, the power of insight and foresight, are phases of prophecy that belonged to all the great historic religions of the ancient world. I mentioned this fact in my introductory paragraphs, because it was too important to be omitted in any fair examination of the subject. But, while I admit that some of the

phenomena of prophecy are to be found in heathendom, of which fact Balaam's oracles afford conclusive proof, I indicate clearly and distinctly in my lecture *the two distinguishing characteristics of Hebrew prophecy*, namely, its nature and its contents. Hence, when my critic represents me as teaching that "the Hebrew prophecies have been in degree better than the heathen, but they are essentially the same kind of thing," he gives a representation which my own explicit statement would have corrected, had it not been wholly disregarded by him throughout the entire controversy, for I say as plainly as language can be made to speak, "Though they possess certain general features in common, Hebrew prophecy differs from pagan prophecy by the possession of certain special features. A comparison of the former with the latter reveals important and essential points of difference. Kindred as may have been their character in earlier ages, in later ages there is nothing between them similar, much less identical. The distinguishing differences consist especially in the peculiar nature and contents of Hebrew prophecy. Its nature is peculiar, in that it claims to be a special divine revelation; its contents are peculiar, in that they profess to unfold a special divine purpose. By these two fundamental features Hebrew prophecy is essentially differentiated or distinguished from any form of pagan prophecy." In this way I teach that Hebrew prophecy differs from heathen prophecy in *kind*, as well as in *degree*, the one being *essentially differentiated* from the other.

In my discussion, I show that *prophecy has a twofold origin.* After stating that it is a phenomenon peculiar to all great primitive religions, I suggest that it seems to have sprung originally from a deep desire for knowledge in respect to spiritual realities and temporal contingencies. This suggestion is made

among my introductory remarks, where I am dealing with the human side of prophecy in prehistoric times. Even here I teach that from the very beginnings of prophecy there was a spiritual or religious element in it, as the expression "spiritual realities" implies. In close connection, I state that something of God has been implanted in every man, that a measure of his Spirit has been vouchsafed to every man, and that, consequently, a portion of his truth has been received by every race of men. Then, when I come to discuss the character of Old Testament prophecy, I teach that it has not only a human, but also a divine or supernatural, side, and that the spiritual or religious truths which it embodies were the outcome of superhuman agency, or of supernatural inspiration. When my critic, therefore, characterizes my lecture as "rationalistic," and accuses me of teaching that prophecy "arose out of the natural desire to know the future," the accusation, no less than the characterization, is terribly unfair. In the opening paragraph of my lecture, I show that prophecy was originally concerned with "spiritual realities," as well as "temporal contingencies;" and, in the first paragraph of my chapter on the origin of Messianic prophecy, I explicitly affirm, "As prophecy is a part of revelation, and as revelation is an outcome of divine agency, Messianic prophecy, like all true prophecy, originated through the energizing influence of the Spirit of God. 'No prophecy,' says Peter, to quote the Revisers' rendering, 'ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.' All prophetic Scripture, whether general or particular, is inspired of God. Without recognizing the reality of moral and religious inspiration, such a thing as prophecy proper becomes practically inexplicable." Had this explicit statement been regarded, I could not have been accused of questioning the supernatural origin of prophecy.

In my discussion, I teach that *Messianic prophecy was a development* from certain germinal ideas belonging to an early period in the history of the Hebrew race. Inasmuch as this branch of prophecy has some special features of its own, its essential contents arose, through divine illumination, from the organic connection of the Old Testament prophecy with the central ideas of the Jewish religion, this organic connection resembling the relation of a germ to a flower, or the relation of an incipient truth to a developed truth. Of these germinal ideas, which were inspired by the Divine Spirit in the hearts of the Hebrew people, there are three, I show, which possess particular significance, namely, the idea of the covenant, the idea of the kingdom, and the idea of the theocracy. The first inspired a lofty hope; the second suggested a universal dominion; the third foreshadowed a glorious Prince of Peace. From this last idea more particularly, Messianic prophecy, in its strict sense as prophecy concerning an ideal Coming One, was supernaturally developed. My critic, however, describes my explanation as "naturalistic," and asserts that I teach "the natural development of Messianic prophecy from germinal ideas;" but there is not a naturalistic or a rationalistic suggestion in any part of my discussion. I teach explicitly in my lecture that the germinal ideas from which Messianic prophecy was developed "were planted in the minds of the people of Israel by divine revelation," and that "the development was in harmony with God's method of education in providence and with his method of discipline in grace." These quotations show that I teach, as all my critical reviewers understood me to teach, the progressive spiritual development of God-inspired ideas under the constant influence of the Divine Spirit.

In my discussion, I show that *prophetic inspiration*

was not something unconscious and mechanical, but something conscious and experimental. The ancient prophets did not publish unintelligible mysteries which they could not comprehend. Though they did not know when the promised Messiah would appear, because the time element was necessarily an indefinite element, they knew the real meaning of their statements as truly as a modern preacher knows the real meaning of his statements. I emphasized this fact because of a very erroneous notion, namely, that the prophets did not always understand their own prophetic utterances, but that, after delivering a message, an inspired man had to examine his own words, in order to find out just what they meant; whereas the Revisers' rendering of 1 Peter i. 10, 11, the passage commonly quoted in support of this view, proves conclusively that the inquiry in the minds of the prophets, to which the apostle here refers, pertained not to the meaning of their own utterances, but to the precise time when the idea represented in the passage should be realized. Hence Peter describes the prophets as "searching what *time* or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." Because I try to get this fact known, my critic, who holds that "the prophecy of future events is essentially miraculous," and that "the predictive is the written form of the miraculous," accuses me of having "a special theory to maintain." But I am not maintaining any special theory when I teach that a true prophet was a man consciously inspired of God to communicate intelligible messages rather than to utter miraculous predictions. While, in my opinion, we should no more speak of miraculous prediction than of miraculous conversion, I hold that there was a supernatural agency at work in prophecy, just as there is in conversion; and I maintain the supernatural character of the spiritual insight and

foresight possessed by the prophets. For the sake of getting the nature of prophetic inspiration apprehended according to the facts of Scripture, I state in my lecture that, since there is a human as well as a divine side to prophecy, "the prophet's message was the outcome of divine illumination, resulting from spiritual fellowship with God, together with reverent reflection on divine truth." The process I describe as having been "analogous to that of personal religious experience on the part of pious Christian people." Then, after observing that the direct operation of the Spirit must be the same for all men, because God has but one method of communicating moral or spiritual truth to the human mind, I say again that "all true prophecy originated by the direct operation of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit, and that it entered into consciousness, not as an imaginary, but as an actual, conviction."

In my discussion, I explain that *the import of prophecy* must be determined by the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, the fundamental principle of which is to gather from each part of Scripture the precise meaning which the speaker or writer intended to convey. Hence an exegete should always ask, What did the prophet mean by his message? What did he consciously intend his hearers to understand by it? This is the sole question with which an interpreter of prophecy is concerned. As this is the only method of interpretation sanctioned by scientific scholars at the present time, I dwelt upon it at considerable length; and, in order to get it duly understood, I stated that our first effort, as exegetes, must be to ascertain what the Old Testament writers themselves meant in the age in which they lived. When investigating the historic meaning of the Old Testament, I said, we may keep the New Testament closed. For showing that, in the work of

interpretation, prophecy and fulfilment must be kept distinct, my critic accuses me of holding "some theory of Messianic prophecy which cannot bear the light of the New Testament." This accusation is most unfair. When studying the Old Testament for doctrinal purposes, we must regard its organic connection with the New; but when studying the Old Testament for critical purposes, that is for the sake of finding out what a certain prophet taught in any given age, we need not, and should not, consider the New Testament quotations at all. As the prophets spoke and wrote for the edification and instruction of their own contemporaries, we must, if we would understand what they taught, endeavor to ascertain the meaning which the people took, and which they intended the people to take, from their inspired utterances, for this is the only meaning which their teaching can properly be said to have. Most traditional interpreters have failed to discriminate between *the historic meaning* and *the doctrinal significance* of a prophetic passage. A theologian has to deal with the latter, but an exegete is concerned simply with the former. Because of failing to make this distinction, uncritical exegetes have suggested that, in studying prophecy, we should seek to ascertain, not the sense in which the prophets understood their own deliverances, but the sense in which the Deity intended them to be understood. This suggestion, however, is a preposterous one; for, if a prophet was consciously, and not mechanically, inspired by the Divine Spirit, the sense in which he understood his prophecy was the sense in which God intended him to understand it. Hence the meaning in the mind of the prophet was the true meaning of his prophecy. Traditional interpreters are responsible for putting forth the erroneous doctrine of a double sense in Scripture—a doctrine which, as Dr.

Terry in his standard work on Hermeneutics says, "unsettles all sound interpretation." Prophecy has, and can have, but one meaning, and that is the conscious thought of the person who consciously uttered it.

In my discussion, I show that the word for *Messiah* in Hebrew is an adjective used as a substantive, signifying anointed or anointed one, and that throughout the Old Testament it is always employed as an official title, and never as a proper name. In its special technical application, the word is merely an ordinary title of the human king who was appointed by Jehovah to occupy the throne of Israel. The first royal personage to whom this title is applied in Scripture is Saul. In the technical use of the word, therefore, Saul was the first Messiah, David was the second Messiah, Solomon was the third Messiah; and so long as the Hebrew kingdom lasted, every rightly constituted Hebrew monarch was a true Messiah, and was called "Jehovah's Messiah," or "Anointed One." Thus, from the conception of Jehovah's anointed, which, from the time of David, was always associated with his royal house, there originated the conception of an ideal Messiah who was expected to rule in righteousness over the people of Israel, and bring to them prosperity and peace. I speak of this expected ruler as an ideal Messiah for two reasons: first, because while the Israelites had a rightful king they had a real Messiah; and second, because, as modern scholars know, the Old Testament conception of this expected ruler is mainly an ideal. The conception which the prophets give of him is that of a Coming One, who is described by them as a second David, but is never called by them a Messiah. In view of these well-known facts, I teach that while, in a general sense, the term *Messianic* may be applied to any prophetic descrip-

tion that relates to the consummation and perfection of the kingdom of God on earth, in the strict sense, it should be applied only to those prophecies in which the hope of Israel centres in an ideal person who was expected in the future. *Messianic prophecy proper* relates strictly to a person; and I confined my discussion to the personal aspect of the subject, in order to show where the reference to this ideal Messiah first occurs in Scripture. When I speak of the ideal Messiah, I do not mean that the ancient prophets did not expect a real person, but I mean that their representations of him are ideal. In Isaiah ix. 2-7, as I show, there occurs the first Messianic prophecy, in the true sense of the term; that is, in this passage we meet for the first time with the idea of a personal Messiah in the sense of a coming ruler or deliverer. From this time onward, numerous representations of this ideal Messiah appear in the Old Testament. But, inasmuch as the prophets expected a purely temporal ruler, who should establish an earthly kingdom and occupy an earthly throne, I teach that their representations did not refer directly and predictively to Jesus of Nazareth, who was a purely spiritual ruler and established a purely spiritual kingdom, but that they foreshadowed him spiritually and officially. Hence, when my critic accuses me of denying "the strictly Messianic character of Old Testament prophecies," and of being in this respect worse than an unbelieving Jew, he does me a great injustice; for I assert that from the time of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the canonical prophets foreshadowed a personal Messiah, and had clearly before their minds the advent of a personal Messiah. What I have tried to make clear to the Church is, that this personal Messiah was perceived by the prophets only in the great outlines of his character and office and work, and that individual representa-

tions, given by them to portray the Coming One, are taken from circumstances connected with their own times, which can be applied to our Lord only in an ideal or, better, in a spiritual sense. On this principle I show that there are nine definite prophecies of a personal Messiah in the Old Testament which, in a primary sense, apply to Jesus, and receive their true spiritual fulfilment in him alone.

In my discussion, I distinguish carefully between the terms, *original reference* and *spiritual reference.* By the first I mean a primary or historic reference; by the second I mean a secondary or special reference. For example, the primary or historic reference of a personal Messianic prophecy, such as Isaiah ix. 2-7, is to the ideal temporal Messiah as then conceived in the mind of the prophet; the primary or historic reference of a poetic passage, such as Psalm ii. 7, is to a historic person, namely, the theocratic king mentioned in the preceding verse of the psalm; the primary or historic reference of a prophetic passage, such as Isaiah vii. 14, is to a child who was shortly to be born, and whose birth should serve as a sign or pledge that the land in question would speedily be forsaken of its kings. These illustrations ought to make my meaning plain. But, disregarding this distinction utterly, my critic charges me with denying "that there is any reference to Christ in the Old Testament," whereas I distinctly teach that all personal Messianic prophecy refers officially to Jesus of Nazareth, and that all impersonal spiritual prophecy refers spiritually to him, for the reason that, "he is the central or focal point," as I say, "in which all lines of Messianic prophecy converge." Notwithstanding what I distinctly state, he asserts that, "if there is no 'original reference' to Christ in the Old Testament, there is no reference at all." This assertion is unfair to my teaching, as well

as to the teaching of the Bible. There may be, as those acquainted with the facts of Scripture know, a spiritual or an official reference to the office and work of Jesus Christ, because all Old Testament revelation culminates in him, without there being a primary or historic reference to his person and life. Again, because I do not admit any direct predictive reference to Jesus of Nazareth, though I do admit and avow a spiritual reference to him, my critic repeatedly accuses me of laboring "to exclude the Christ of history" from Old Testament prophecy, and of explaining every passage I discuss "so as to exclude all reference to Christ." But, while I do exclude reference to Jesus in his sense of the term, that is, in the sense of a definite and detailed prediction, I do not exclude reference to him in my own sense of the term, that is, in the sense of a spiritual or an official foreshadowing. Not satisfied with ignoring my plain distinction, he suggests that the words, "original reference," as used by me, "become a blind to keep the reader from seeing that all predictive reference to Christ is denied;" but the very thing which he suggests I would keep the reader from seeing is the very thing which I desire the reader to see, and which I try to get the reader to see. When I say that there is no prophetic passage in the Old Testament that has an original reference to the New Testament Messiah, I mean, and I wish every reader to perceive my meaning, that there is no passage in which Jesus of Nazareth stood objectively before the writer's mind, or in which there is a direct, detailed, predictive reference to his personal life, as distinguished from his official work. Thus I try to get all men to see that Jesus Christ was never in the Old Testament literally and historically, but only typically and spiritually; so that, when the New Testament writers speak of certain Old Testament

passages as referring to Jesus, they mean that such passages testify of him, or bear witness to him, that is, refer to him spiritually or officially. "The ancient Hebrew Scriptures are saturated with Messianic prophecy," I say in my lecture, "but in a sense deeper than Christian people commonly suppose. Because of the divine element in prophecy, the Old Testament is full of Christ, not in the sense of prediction, but in the sense of testimony."

In my discussion, I discriminate between *the meaning* and *the application* of prophecy, because, though a prophetic passage has but one meaning, it may have numerous applications. That is to say, the principle contained in the passage may be applied on more than one occasion, and to more than one person. But my critic represents me as teaching that "a prophecy (which) actually meant a living person or a current event" may be "legitimately applied to a future event or person which was not its original object," whereas I teach that it is the underlying principle of a prophetic passage, not the prophecy itself, that is legitimately applicable in such a case. For instance, when the Psalmist, speaking for Jehovah, says, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee," he means that the earthly king, mentioned in the preceding verse of the psalm, has been received into the relation of divine sonship; but, in the New Testament, the principle of sonship which the passage contains is thrice applied to our Lord. The underlying principle of the passage is given a special application to Jesus, because, as "the only begotten from the Father," he was the Son of God in a higher sense than the king of Israel was. Again, in Matthew xv. 7-9, a passage respecting hypocrisy, that was originally employed by Isaiah to reprove his wicked contemporaries, is specially applied by Christ himself to the worldly-minded people of his day, because it contains a principle

particularly applicable to religious hypocrites. These two cases will illustrate how the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament is quoted and applied in the New Testament. Hence, in my lecture, I show the difference between *interpreting* and *applying* prophecy. The New Testament writers quote the language of the Old Testament very freely, as well as very frequently; but, since they were not acting as interpreters when thus quoting it, they tell us nothing about its true historic meaning. They merely show us the typical or spiritual use that may legitimately be made of it, in accordance with the recognized practice of the time; for the Jews of that day made a typical use or application, not only of prophecy, but also of history. The fundamental principle of quoting Old Testament language in the New Testament was, I teach, "the moral profitableness of all God-inspired Scripture." All the Gospel quotations from the ancient Scriptures may be explained on this apostolic principle.

In my discussion, I show that the word *fulfil*, in its New Testament use, signifies a special, practical application or realization of the principle contained in an Old Testament passage. Hence, in harmony with the literal meaning of the word, which is to fill up or to fill out, when a New Testament writer speaks of an Old Testament passage as being fulfilled, he means that its general teaching is filled up or filled out; in other words, that its underlying principle is fully realized, or its spiritual significance specially and divinely accomplished. For this reason, I distinguish carefully between the terms, *spiritual fulfilment* and *literal fulfilment*. In making this distinction, I desire to correct the mistaken notion of those who wrongly regard prophecy as synonymous with prediction, and who unfortunately look upon nearly every prophetic passage quoted in the New Testament

as having received a literal fulfilment in the Gospel; whereas, in the sense in which the evangelists and apostles use the word fulfil, as well as in the sense in which they manifestly meant it to be taken, allowing them to explain themselves, their special application does not imply a literal, but a spiritual, fulfilment. From an examination of every important passage I find that there is not a single exception to this rule. My critic, however, who makes a wrong use of the words "prediction" and "fulfilment," refuses to consider what he unfairly calls my "notions" as to their right use, and represents me as trying to belittle them and to explain them away. But my explanation of the word prophecy as a term of wider meaning than prediction is acknowledged by the best interpreters, and my explanation of the word fulfil was anticipated by Mr. Wesley. In his Notes on the New Testament he explicitly says, "A passage of Scripture, whether prophetic, historical, or poetical, is, in the language of the New Testament, fulfilled when an event happens to which it may with great propriety be accommodated." In accordance, therefore, with Mr. Wesley's canon, which is literally and strictly true, although he did not see the universal application of it, I regard the leading prophetic statements of the Old Testament (and the New Testament citation of them shows that our Lord and his apostles so regarded them) as setting forth the great outlines of the character and office of Christ, and as containing the fundamental principles of his work and kingdom. It will be seen, therefore, that I teach, as I understood the evangelists and apostles to teach, that the truths and principles of Old Testament prophecy were absolutely fulfilled in him and in him alone, not literally, but spiritually and officially. In other words, I teach that every spiritual truth and principle contained in the Hebrew Scriptures was filled out, or filled up, or fully realized, in the life and truth and work of Christ.

In my discussion, I dwell at considerable length on *the spirit of prophecy*, because so many traditional interpreters, mistaking prophecy for prediction, have overlooked its deeper spiritual import; and, in harmony with principle of Revelation xix. 10, which supports and confirms my view, I show that the spirit of prophecy is testimony, the testimony of Jesus. As testifying or bearing witness to divine truth is the fundamental element which lies at the basis of all true prophecy, so testifying or bearing witness to Jesus, or to the truth as it is in Jesus, is the fundamental feature which characterizes the spiritual prophecy of the Old and New Testament Scriptures alike. For this reason, I say in my lecture that "the spiritual witness or testimony borne to Jesus as its fundamental theme is the sum and substance of Messianic prophecy." In spite of what I say, however, my critic persistently represents my whole discussion of prophetic Scripture as "rationalistic and out of harmony with evangelical interpretation." But I need not stop to deal again with the unfairness of such representation. Before concluding this paragraph, I wish to show concisely how the office of prophecy helps us to understand the spirit of prophecy. The special office of a prophet was to declare the divine will and to interpret the divine purpose. The declaration of the divine will had particular reference to the present; the interpretation of the divine purpose had particular reference to the future. Because of his insight into the truth of God and of his foresight respecting the purpose of God, a prophet testified both to that which was and to that which was to come. This explanation should enable every one to see the way in which the predictive element in prophecy grows out of the moral or ethical element. As Jesus was the outcome of a special divine purpose, and as

Messianic prophecy was the gradual unfolding of that purpose, therefore, he was spiritually the subject of all such prophecy. Not only were the divine communications of the prophets pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, being inspired by the same Spirit which fully dwelt in him, but also, in a deep divine sense, he was the essential theme of their prophetic utterances. In this manner I show that the whole of the Old Testament revelation was prophetic, and that everything pertaining to the Spirit's dispensation in Old Testament times was a silent spiritual prophecy of him who was to come. Inasmuch as Jesus was the perfect revealer of God, all spiritual revelations previous to his coming prepared for him, led up to him, and culminated in him; so that the apostles and evangelists consistently found in Jesus of Nazareth him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets wrote, because the divine element in the Old Testament spiritually speaks of him, or spiritually relates to him, in the sense of testifying or bearing witness to him.

In my discussion, I devote some of my most earnest pages to a consideration of *the true purpose of prophecy;* and, among my introductory remarks, I expressly state that one chief object of my investigation is to indicate "its evidential value in regard to Christ and Christianity." Inasmuch, however, as the argument from prophecy has been improperly used by Christian apologists, most of whom have employed it for dogmatic purposes, I distinguish carefully between the *evidential value* and the *dogmatic* or *apologetic purpose* of prophecy. The old apologists used it dogmatically or apologetically to prove the divinity of Christianity; but a wise apologist should use it evidentially, not to prove the divinity of Christianity, but to prove the unity and reality of revelation. But my critic, who supposes that "predictions and fulfil-

ments were the chief arguments used by the apostles to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah foretold by the prophets," accuses me of weakening and destroying by my teaching "the evidential value of prophecy." Here the supposition is as erroneous as the accusation is unfair. In their addresses to their fellow-countrymen, the apostles did not claim that Jesus was the Messiah because he fulfilled prophecy; but, like our Lord himself, they claimd that he fulfilled prophecy because he was the Messiah. While my teaching does weaken the evidential value of prophecy in his sense of the term, namely, as evidence of "the wonderful correspondence between the predictions of the Old Testament and the events recorded in the Gospels," my teaching does not weaken its evidential value in my sense of the term, namely, as evidence of the unity and reality of "a revelation resulting from the influence of the Divine Spirit." Prophecy is not miraculous prediction, but supernatural instruction. God did not raise up the prophetic ministry to predict minute circumstances in the life of our Lord—circumstances which could have conveyed to their own time no definite idea, and which could have inculcated no important lesson; but he raised up this ministry to unfold to the faith of the people of their own day the great fundamental principles of the future Messiah's work and kingdom. Hence prediction is not an evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus. The evidence of his Messiahship is his holy life, his heavenly truth, his reconciling and redemptive work. Nor is prediction the evidence of the divine inspiration of the prophets. The evidence of their inspiration is their insight into divine truth and their foresight respecting divine redemption. Therefore, as prophecy is not synonymous with prediction, although it contains a predictive element which is based upon the moral or spiritual element, it should

not be used dogmatically or apologetically to prove the divinity of Christianity, because the proof of Christianity is Christ himself—his life, his truth, his work; but it should be used evidentially to attest the reality of Old Testament revelation and to evince the unity of all revelation—Ethnic, Jewish, and Christian. Old Testament prophecy had both a doctrinal and an educational purpose, under God, in training and preparing mankind for the reception of the truth as it is in Christ.

Thus, in harmony with the accepted canons of sacred hermeneutics, I wrote my lecture for the purpose of elucidating the great central theme of the Bible. When applying the principles of Biblical interpretation to prophetic passages, I tried modestly to remove a number of unfortunate misconceptions with regard to their historic meaning; but, in every case, my criticism was as genuinely constructive as it was meant to be corrective. Since prophecy has both a human or temporal and a divine or spiritual side, I endeavored, in accordance with the soundest modern Christian scholarship, to set forth the human element in its true relation to the divine element. But, with respect to every vital point in my discusssion, by ignoring my definitions and distinctions, my critic either accuses me of doing what I have not done, and what no honest man would do, or represents me as teaching what I have not taught, and what no Christian scholar could teach. He not only seizes upon certain expressions that should be interpreted in the light of my discriminative statements, and puts upon them constructions which I do not intend, but also takes a sentence here and there from the lecture, regardless of its logical connection, and grouping a number of such sentences together, conveys a wrong meaning to the public. In each of these ways he produces the impression on the mind of

the reader that I disparage the divine authority and deny the divine character of prophetic Scripture. While all impartial readers have correctly apprehended every essential feature of my view, and all critical reviewers have duly emphasized its scientific and religious value, he characterizes my theory of prophecy as "nebulous" and "negative," and describes my presentation of the subject as a "low view" supported only by "advanced rationalists." But further defence of my teaching seems unnecessary. Hence I shall say nothing of the ways in which he charges me with using words in "an equivocal sense," and with employing a "guarded and evasive style"; nor shall I say anything of the ways in which he suspects me of stealing in "any questionable thing" which I wish to be accepted "under some ambiguous, innocent-looking phrase," and of making "a Greek horse of ambiguous words to carry the enemy stealthily into the city of God." To discuss insinuations so unjust and so unworthy would not be edifying.

Of the adverse criticisms of my book very little needs to be said. In a volume, entitled "The Riddle of Existence Solved," which claims to be an answer to Professor Goldwin Smith's "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence," Mr. W. J. Fenton has devoted some thirty pages to my book; and in a pamphlet, entitled "The Old Testament Its Own Defence," Rev. J. S. Cook, B.D., has attempted to answer "The Old Testament Vindicated." Neither of these writers seems to understand my teaching, and both of them have sadly misinterpreted it; but, as I do not think their misinterpretations have done me any harm, I will not discuss them.

There is one misconception, however, with respect to the teaching of my book which I wish in a few words to correct. In common with the best Christian

scholars of the day, I teach that in the Bible, as in the person of Christ, there is both a human and a divine element, and that it is the presence of the divine element in the Bible which constitutes its inspiration. In common with the best Christian scholars, too, I teach that in the Biblical writings, as in all other composite writings, there is a great variety of literature, and that each part of the Bible should be interpreted in harmony with the laws which govern that particular kind of literature. A knowledge of these facts is essential to a true interpretation of the Scriptures. But one of my senior brethren must have failed to apprehend the meaning of what I say, or else he must have failed to appreciate the importance of it; for in his official address to the delegates of the General Conference last September, after referring to certain published views of inspiration and prophecy to which he took exception, the General Superintendent of our Church, as reported in the *Guardian*, said, "I have given you the names of men and systems that graciously concede that the blocks of divine truth are solid enough, but aver they are laid up on human cobble-stones, fastened with man's untempered mortar. The divine power, wisdom, and glory are all mixed up and filled in with human ignorance and weakness. Then the process is easy to slip out one block after another till there is neither wall nor foundation, rampart nor tower."

Though the speaker did not mention either of us by name, it was generally understood that his remarks were directed at the opinions expressed in "The Old Testament Vindicated," by the Chancellor of Victoria University, as well as by the author of the book. This volume, however, not simply concedes, it maintains, "that the blocks of divine truth are solid enough," but it does not "aver they are laid up on human cobble-stones, fastened with man's untempered

mortar." This volume distinctly teaches that, while we should not put all the books of the Bible on the same level, or attach to all parts of it the same importance, "every book in the Canon has a certain value, and was written for a worthy object, or with a worthy purpose." Hence, according to this teaching, no book of the Bible can be removed, as the General Superintendent suggests, because each book has both its place and its purpose in the Canon. One object of "The Old Testament Vindicated" is to show that, while there are two elements in the Bible—the one human, the other divine—we should hold as firmly to the divine element which faith recognizes as to the human element which reason sees, and that the human element in Scripture is as essential to a true revelation of God to man as was the humanity of Christ to his work as the Saviour of the world.

III.

VINDICATION OF THE VIEW.

After defending my teaching, I have next to present my testimonies. The number of assurances I have received as to the nature and importance of my lecture, as well as my book, is very large; and they have come not only from Biblical scholars and theological students, but also from Christian ministers and pious laymen all over this continent. I shall submit a few extracts from letters and reviews, first respecting the lecture, and then respecting the book.

As soon as the lecture was distributed it was endorsed and commended in the *Old Testament Student*, edited by Dr. W. R. Harper, then Professor of Hebrew in Yale University, but now President of Chicago University. After giving a complete and beautiful synopsis of the article, the synoptist refers to the striking and convincing character of the discussion, adding, "It emphasizes many important facts which are too often overlooked, and represents the general position of progressive scholars of the present day."

In the Toronto *Week* for February 27th, 1891, Professor Herbert Symonds, M.A., then of Trinity University, printed an extended and appreciative review in which he speaks of what he calls my "altogether admirable essay" as "a thoroughly scientific treatment of prophecy, based upon the results of modern criticism, but orthodox in doctrine and reverent in tone"; and, after contrasting my view of the subject with

the foolish views that have obtained for a long time, he says, "I cannot conclude these remarks without observing that he has laid his finger upon the source of the inadequate and mistaken views of prophecy already referred to, and has indicated the true means of reaching sounder conclusions."

On March 14th, 1891, Dr. G. H. Gilbert, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the leading Congregational College in Chicago, wrote respecting the lecture, "I have caught its argument, I think, and I want to say that I like it. I believe your theory is sound, rational, and so, of course, profitable in its outworking. . . . I thank you for the article, congratulate you upon it, and should think it would be profitable to continue work along this line."

The week I resigned my position in the College, a minister who has since been President of the Hamilton Conference, spontaneously wrote me the following testimony:—"The more carefully I have studied your arguments and expositions, the clearer, deeper, richer seems the stream of prophecy flowing through the Old Testament fields till they reach their grand fulfilment in the Christ of the New Testament."

The next week, another minister who has since been President of the Hamilton Conference, spontaneously sent me the following testimony:—"When the truth is understood, the Messianic argument is made, by the newer light, unspeakably stronger and more rationally appreciable." A few weeks later, after reading an expository letter on Isaiah liii. 1-12, which I had written to the Toronto papers, the same minister wrote of his own accord again, "I am beginning to see more and more the practical force of your ideal and moral view of the Messianic thought, and believe it gives great advantage to the Christian argument as against the rationalistic and sceptical position."

Two years ago next August, while he was attending the meetings of the British Association of Science in Toronto, Dr. G. S. Duncan, pastor of Eckington Presbyterian Church, Washington, and Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in Howard University, called one day to make my acquaintance and to ask me to let him read my discussion of prophecy. After reading the essays, he wrote me as follows :—"I cannot tell you how very much I have enjoyed your two articles on Messianic prophecy. I have read them with great care and made extensive notes from each. They are the best things I have ever read on prophecy. Your articles are scholarly and Biblical. The positions you take cannot be overthrown. . . . I wish to thank you for what the two articles have been to me in clearing up some points."

These are but specimens of the written testimonies respecting the importance of the lecture that have come to me during the past nine years, and the verbal testimonies I have received have been quite as strong, but much more numerous. At a regular meeting, held in the Centenary church six years ago last December, it was verbally endorsed in very flattering terms by most of the leading members of the Hamilton Ministerial Association. These facts show that the doctrinal soundness of my lecture was never questioned by anyone who read and studied it impartially.

The kind things said about "The Old Testament Vindicated" by readers and reviewers have exceeded, in both number and degree, anything I dared allow myself to expect when preparing it for the press. No other work I have published has brought me so many encouraging expressions of appreciation or so many gratifying acknowledgments of helpfulness. These have come from ministers and teachers, from professors and students, from men and women, from old and young. The critical notices of the book by

both secular and ecclesiastical journals have been most complimentary; and either its apologetic or its practical value has been emphasized by the leading religious periodicals of this country.

In a long editorial notice the *Canada Presbyterian* bears the following testimony:—"The book is a highly creditable piece of work, showing the qualities of clear statement and consecutive argument. . . . Difficulties must be met, and faith must constantly find new intellectual expression; and, as an apologetic treatise meeting reckless statements in a sober, patient way, this little book is to be commended for its reverent spirit and constructive aims."

The following appreciative words are from an editorial notice in the *Canadian Baptist*:—"The volume is marked on every page by scholarship and ability. It is written in a terse and vigorous style, and is admirable in the simple directness with which the author proceeds in every case straight to the point before him, and in its freedom from useless epithets and technical phraseology."

The following notice from the *Canadian Churchman* bears witness to the importance of distinguishing between the human and the divine element in the Bible:—"An excellent little volume. . . . The Old Testament is not itself a Divine revelation, but it is the record of such a revelation; and this is not the least brought into doubt by the human element in its composition. Dr. Workman brings out this aspect of the subject with effect and cogency; and we strongly recommend his book."

The following critical notice is from the *Methodist Magazine and Review*:—"What Sir William Dawson has done concerning Geology, and Dallinger and Le Conte concerning Evolution, in rescuing these sciences from the service of Infidelity, Dr. Workman in this work strives to do with Modern Theology in general

and Higher Criticism in particular. . . . Intelligent readers will pronounce it an excellent antidote to the more destructive type of Higher Criticism which is insidiously working very great havoc."

The following discriminative sentences are from an editorial notice in the *Christian Guardian*:—"In this book we have the work of a thorough Hebrew scholar; at the same time the work is not pedantic, but popular. Rationalistic criticism must be met by reverent criticism; destructive scholarship must be met by conservative, constructive scholarship, and hasty historical research must be met by more patient and more profound historical research."

Only a few months ago the *Sunday School Times*, of Philadelphia, strongly commended the book, not only for the way I have answered Dr. Goldwin Smith, but also for the way I have defended the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. "The Old Testament Vindicated," says the reviewer, "was carefully prepared, and is well worth perusal. It is not a diatribe, but a calm and orderly examination of Professor Smith's statements, in order to show how he misrepresented the views of Biblical scholars. Dr. Workman distinguishes between different classes of such scholars. . . . He makes especial havoc of that pet charge of the half-baked sceptic, and, unfortunately, of the over-zealous conservative, that the progressive Bible student of to-day is in great danger of losing his reverence for the Bible as a divine book."

In this connection, I may add the following testimony from Rev. Dr. Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, as to the apologetic importance of the volume:—"It is in every respect a complete and masterly reply. I know of no better work to put into the hands of studious inquirers and young men alienated from the truth by science falsely so-called.

. . . A valiant service to Christianity, and a notable contribution to apologetics."

With respect to its apologetic value, I may here just mention the testimony of Dr. Davidson Macdonald, who told me at the General Conference last September that my book had had a steadying influence on the native missionaries of our Church in Japan.

In addition to these spontaneous testimonies as to the character and value of my teaching, I desire to submit four formal statements, each prepared by a competent Biblical scholar at my request. Before submitting them, however, I wish to say that in neither of the works under consideration is the question of doctrine, in the technical sense of the term, involved. My discussion of the Old Testament in general, and of Messianic prophecy in particular, is a matter of interpretation, not of doctrine.

The only theological doctrine at all involved in anything I have written about the Bible is that of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures—a doctrine which I hold as firmly as any man holds it, and which I have recognized in everything I have ever taught. My expository work has always been performed in recognition of the divine character and the supreme authority of Scripture. I mentioned this fact in each of my communications to the Board, as a reference to the letters will show.

But, inasmuch as many persons have declared, and many others have been led to believe, that my teaching is not in harmony with our doctrinal standards, I have asked for these statements from Biblical experts, in order to convince those who have been misled by unfair proceedings and false reports that my views of Scripture are in harmony, not only with the doctrinal standards of our own Church, but also with the doctrinal standards of every evangelical

Church ; and that my principles of criticism and interpretation are in perfect accord with those of scientific Biblical scholars throughout the world.

The first statement is a short but pregnant one from Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's University, and reads as follows :—

"KINGSTON, Ont., 24th January, 1899.

"*To the Committee :*

"No fundamental doctrine is involved in the critical discussion of Messianic prophecy ; and in my opinion Dr. Workman's faith in Christianity must have been strengthened by his critical examination of the Old Testament. His faith rests now, not on tradition, but on spiritual verities. His positions and conclusions are in the main the same as those which every competent scholar in the Scottish Churches holds.

"G. M. GRANT, *Principal.*"

The second statement is from Rev. Professor Scrimger, of the Montreal Presbyterian College.

"MONTREAL, Sept. 14th, 1898.

"MY DEAR DR. WORKMAN,—

"At your request I have read your two articles in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* on Messianic prophecy, and I have much pleasure in expressing to you my appreciation of the ability, thoroughness, and candor with which you have discussed a somewhat difficult and much misunderstood subject.

"I confess that I approached the reading of the articles with some prejudice against what I supposed was your position. The only extract from them which I had previously seen was a portion of a sentence on page 448 (Oct. '90) stating that 'there is no passage in the Old Testament that refers directly and

predictively to Jesus Christ.' Somewhat hastily, perhaps, but not altogether unnaturally, I understood this to mean a denial of the existence of any genuine Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament—a conclusion which I could not for a moment accept. The immediate context, however, and the whole argument of the paper make it perfectly clear to me that this is not your meaning. On the contrary, they show that you hold firmly to the genuineness of Messianic prophecy as one of the most characteristic elements of the Old Testament Scriptures. I am glad to have my error corrected, and to find that you stand where the Universal Church has always stood on this fundamental point.

"The view which you take of that prophecy, as being primarily the presentation of an ideal Kingdom and an ideal King for the consolation and encouragement of the prophets' contemporaries, is also, I am satisfied, the only sound and tenable one. Being an ideal picture, which they confidently expected would some day be realized in its essential features, if not in minute details, of course the prophecy is also predictive in a sense, though not in the sense so often erroneously attributed to the prophets. Like all other ideals in the world, it was, even at the best of times, too vague and shadowy to be ever exactly realized, but was none the less valuable and helpful on that account to those who caught the spirit of it and felt its power. In the darkest and least spiritual periods of Israel's history, it brought to some an uplift infinitely greater than could be furnished by anything in heathen religion, philosophy, or art. To some, no doubt, it will seem as if this view meant the loss of some effective *ad captandum* arguments for the truth of Christianity. But, apart from these, Christianity does not lack for sound arguments, sufficient to convince all who are willing to hear; and the

prophets can hardly be supposed to have had any such apologetic purpose in mind when delivering their message.

"As for the Messianic passages in detail, your interpretation of them and of the principles that underlie their application in the New Testament, are substantially those which I have given for many years back, and which are now adopted by the best theologians of all evangelical schools, except that of Hengstenberg. They are the only ones which seem to be in harmony with all the facts both of the Old and the New Testament, and the only ones which are true to the grammatico-historical method, which alone has any right to be regarded as scientific. The spiritual instinct that finds Christ everywhere in the Old Testament is a true one at bottom, and may be safely enough trusted for the edification of believers. But the rational justification of the process by which it is arrived at is by no means the simple matter that some have supposed. It is rarely to be found on the surface, and must be sought in those fundamental principles on which all true religion rests. Your exposition of them is as good and clear as any I know. I have no difficulty in reconciling it with the requirements of evangelical thought.

"I remain,

"Yours very truly,

"JOHN SCRIMGER."

The third statement is from Rev. Professor Terry, of the Garrett Biblical Institute.

"EVANSTON, ILL., July 18th, 1898.

"MY DEAR DR. WORKMAN,—

"I have carefully read your articles on Messianic prophecy and your 'Old Testament Vindicated,' and

have also examined the outline of your proposed work on 'The Servant of Jehovah,' and desire to thank you for the personal favor of presenting me with critical discussions of so great value. The subjects treated are of the greatest interest, and deserve much more painstaking study and research than the great body of our ministers and intelligent laymen are giving them.

"There may be room for differences of opinion on minor points of exposition and argument, but I see no ground for any successful attempt at a rational refutation of your main positions. Your discussion of Messianic prophecy is an admirable presentation of the subject, and a very valuable contribution to the expository and apologetical literature of our time. The method pursued and the conclusions reached are, in my judgment, thoroughly consistent with all the essential truths of our evangelical faith, and are of the kind that will best conserve the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures. They are, in fact, a scientific and self-consistent elaboration of critical principles which are accepted and employed again and again in the writings of Martin Luther, and John Wesley, and Adam Clarke.

"It is astonishing to me that so many good and useful men fail to distinguish clearly between matters of literary and scientific criticism and those of fundamental doctrine. With them, to question the traditional authorship of a book like Isaiah, or to adopt a historico-critical method of interpreting the Hebrew prophets, is to unsettle faith in the truth of the Scriptures. They seem to be afraid of thorough scientific discussion of the Biblical writings, and so place themselves in antagonism to one of the fundamental principles of Protestantism. An erroneous method may achieve with the unlearned and superficial a temporary advantage, but in the end it must prove suicidal.

The positive results of modern Biblical criticism will, in my opinion, supply us with material for a more powerful apology for our holy religion than the Church has ever yet possessed; and it will be made clear to all thoughtful minds that the fundamentals of Christianity are not dependent on doubtful traditions touching the composition and date of certain ancient books, but rather on vital truths embodied in the books, which, when clearly apprehended, are able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ.

"For myself, I have long since settled into the calm repose of assured conviction that the devout Christian scholarship of our time is far more competent to form a correct judgment on all questions of Biblical criticism than were the Scribes and Pharisees of old time. How long shall the Church, which solemnly avows a sanctified ambition to promote sound learning, stultify herself by silencing her most accomplished scholars, and by virtually saying to them, You cannot be permitted to discuss with full freedom those questions of Biblical criticism which Jewish Scribes and Christian elders have decided for all time? They who take the responsibility of putting the Church in such an attitude before the world should not feel wronged when a devout and learned scholar like Beyschlag charges them with fostering 'a would-be orthodoxy which, like a somnambulist, goes with its eyes closed on the house-tops of our century.'

"I trust, my dear brother, that you and I may live to see the day when all the Churches of Protestantism will delight to encourage rather than humiliate the earnest Biblical scholars who study and toil only to advance the highest interests of the Church of God.

"Yours in Christian affection and labor,

"MILTON S. TERRY."

The fourth statement is from Rev. Chancellor Burwash, of Victoria University.

"*To the Committee of the Bay of Quinte Conference re Teaching of the Rev. Dr. Workman:*

"GENTLEMEN,—I have been requested by Dr. Workman to place before you an expression of my judgment as to the relation of his teachings to the doctrinal standards of Methodism. In doing this, I confine myself entirely to the published works in which he has expressed his views with as great fulness and clearness as any Canadian theologian. These works are the following:—(1) A lecture on 'Messianic Prophecy,' published in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* for October, 1890; (2) a sequel to this lecture, published in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* for October, 1891; (3.) an address to the students of Queen's University, Kingston, published in the *Canadian Methodist Review* for July and August, 1894; (4) a volume entitled 'The Old Testament Vindicated as Christianity's Foundation-stone.'

"In a matter concerning definition of Doctrine, I have thought it only just that a man should be judged by carefully considered and written statements such as these, and not by 'impressions' or even isolated expressions remembered and repeated from sermons or from personal conversations.

"Of the first and second of these works I expressed my judgment many years ago in the following review, which I still see no reason to change:—

"'The subject of the following treatise is of intense interest and of great importance to all students of the Word of God. The presentation here given is, in some aspects, new; but it is based upon principles which our best and most orthodox scholars regard as

firmly established by a careful inductive study of Old Testament prophecy.

"'It especially recognizes that the one question of the exegete is this, What did the writer consciously intend and expect his readers or hearers to understand from his words? This is the *only meaning* which either prophecy or any other portion of Scripture can properly bear, and all scientific study of either the nature or the contents of prophecy must be based upon such a principle of interpretation.

"'It also recognizes the preëminence of the moral and religious intuition in the prophetic ministry. It was a ministry to the men of the prophet's own age, for the moral and religious instruction of that age, not so much by the prediction of events in the future, as by the enforcement of moral and religious principles in the present. The motives by which these principles are enforced are drawn sometimes from the history of the past, and sometimes from the impending judgments or the glorious hopes which the divinely illumined mind of the prophet descries in the future.

"'But in so far as the prophet introduces the predictive element, the object is not at all to gratify curiosity by an anticipation of history, and to a very limited extent to be the ground of faith in the future by a display of miraculous foreknowledge, but principally to persuade men to faith in God and righteousness of life in the then present. The student, therefore, who fails to recognize this fact, and who approaches the study of prophecy as if it were chiefly a body of startling predictions, must utterly fail to grasp its true meaning.

"'The providence' of God has in our day afforded us remarkable advantages for this historic study of prophecy in the opening up to us of the great histories of Nineveh and Babylon, which run parallel with the greatest of the Old Testament prophets. The Mes-

sianic element in the Old Testament prophecy is its most wonderful characteristic. Nor do I think that this wonderful divine character is at all minified by the comprehensive view of its nature and history now accepted by all our more profound students of Old Testament theology, and embodied in the present work.

"'That God should implant a hope of better things to come in the minds of the primeval fathers of our race; that from the beginning this hope should be conditional on repentance, and embrace as its fundamental religious element the forgiveness of sin; that for the preservation and enlargement of this hope God should enter into covenant with a chosen people; that he should make their history an embodiment of the great spiritual principles by which this hope is ultimately to be realized; that he should raise up for the maintenance of the principles, as well as for the enlargement of this hope, a prophetic ministry extending through centuries; that he should finally concentrate this hope upon a coming personality, an ideal king, saviour, and deliverer, whose office and work and kingdom are described in broad spiritual outline,—this surely is not less divine than would be the most startling predictions of minute events in his life.

"'I do not understand the author for a moment to doubt that Jesus of Nazareth realized to the full the spiritual contents of the Old Testament Messianic prophecy, nor do I understand him to imply that these prophets had before their minds any other historic person, except in the case of those prophecies which he has classed as typical; but I take his conclusion to be that *Messianic prophecy proper* sets forth the ideal person of the Messiah by the broad characteristics of his office and work and the principles of his kingdom, rather than by personal details of the history of Jesus of Nazareth.

"'After careful examination of all the Old Testament passages applied by the evangelists to particular details of the life of our Lord, he thinks that none of these were, in their original use by the prophets, direct predictions of such details, but are instances of an accommodation of language or of thought common to writers of that age.

"'Even those who may hesitate to accept this conclusion as absolute, or who may differ from the author as to the precise date of the beginning of Messianic prophecy proper, must still admit that his broader view of the great scope of Old Testament prophecy is incomparably the more important.

"'I have no doubt that, to the formation of such broader view, the present treatise will afford valuable aid. Its principles are alike important from the exegetic and the apologetic point of view. I, therefore, commend it to the careful, candid, truth-seeking study of all Biblical students.'

"In the third of the articles mentioned above, Dr. Workman has made his statement of 'things which are not shaken,' by 'the various causes which have conspired to create anxiety in religion at the present time.' These he enumerates as God, Immortality, Christ—His person and work, including what he 'taught respecting sin and repentance, faith and pardon, redemption and salvation.'

"This declaration of Dr. Workman's reduces the field of investigation to comparatively narrow limits. But he gives us further direction by an enumeration of certain things which he thinks have been shaken, such as 'Old views of Scripture,' including (1) the inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible; (2) the unity and integrity of some of its books; (3) the character and composition of their subject-matter; (4) the date and authorship of the Pentateuch, of the Psalms, of Deutero-Isaiah and of other parts of Scripture.

"In regard to Nos. (2), (3), and (4) of these particulars, the creeds of Protestant Churches have, without exception, allowed freedom both of investigation and of candid judgment. It is under No. (1) that question arises. His expanded statement on this point is worthy of careful consideration. On page 297, he says, 'If the revelation of the Bible has not been given in the manner men have claimed, there can be no harm in reverently searching the Scriptures to ascertain their testimony on the question. The substance of divine truth is the important thing for us, not the form in which it may have been presented. As the author of all spiritual truth is God, and as the purpose of all inspired Scripture is to bear witness to the truth, the moral truths and spiritual principles of the Bible are inerrant, whatever may be shown to be the case respecting unimportant matters, or matters of detail. It should also be stated that infallibility is a term properly applicable to a person, not to a thing. There is only one infallible authority in religious doctrine; that is, Jesus the Christ. When speaking of the authority and trustworthiness of the Bible, therefore, we should apply the terms inerrancy and infallibility rather to the truth contained in the book than to the book itself. There may be errors in things unessential, but there is no error in essential truth.'

"On the same page, I find also an enumeration of 'Old theories of doctrine that have been shaken,' namely, (1) the age and origin of matter; (2) the antiquity and creation of man; (3) the origin and transmission of sin; (4) the nature and degree of depravity; (5) the institution and significance of sacrifice; (6) the nature and extent of atonement; (7) the substitution of suffering; (8) the imputation of guilt. On the following page, he also enumerates 'Old conceptions of truth that have been shaken,'

such as (1) the mode and extent of inspiration; (2) the character and scope of revelation; (3) the import and interpretation of prophecy, etc.

"I would call the attention of the Committee, in this connection especially, to the two paragraphs on page 298, where he says, 'Without discussing these conceptions, it should be observed that conceptions are simply the notions of men, while truth is the manifestation of God. Conceptions are changeable, but truth is unchangeable; conceptions die, but truth endures; conceptions pass away, but truth abides forever.'

"'It may thus be seen that, though the view or form may change, the substance remains; though the theory may explode, the fact continues; though the conception may vanish, the truth abides. Nothing can destroy the substance; nothing can disprove the fact; nothing can disturb the truth. These are things which no science can shake, which no criticism can touch, and which no investigation can remove.'

"From these passages it seems evident that the field in which Dr. Workman claims freedom of investigation, both as an individual and as a teacher of the Church, includes the following:—(1) The method by which God has revealed himself to men, and the character and interpretation of Scripture as the record of such revelation; (2) the theoretical or speculative side of various doctrines, especially sin and atonement, and their outcome in the future life.

"On some of these points Dr. Workman has furnished no definite statement. But I am pleased to find on the main point the following declaration:—'The inspired Scriptures are still the impregnable rock of divine truth. . . . Nothing vital or essential to religion is imperilled by the critical study of the Scriptures. On the contrary, the great central facts of the Christian faith are thus made to stand out

more prominently in all the purity and simplicity that are in Christ.'

"Within the limits which Dr. Workman thus imposes upon himself, I think he is quite justified in claiming the fullest freedom of critical investigation. Such liberty is sanctioned by all the earliest confessions of Protestantism. In fact, the right of private judgment is so fundamental to Protestantism that the latter could not exist without it. This same liberty, especially in the critical study of the Word of God, was an essential element of early Arminianism, and was fully maintained by John Wesley, when textual criticism and historico-grammatical interpretation were beginning to win the victory over the false views imposed by the dictation theory of inspiration, in his own method of work in his Notes on the New Testament, a work in which he adopted the most advanced results of the critical scholarship of his age. And, last of all, in the face of a great deal of prejudiced opposition, especially from a class of interpreters who find their extreme type in the Plymouth school, but who largely infest our evangelical Churches, this liberty is vindicated by the great body of intelligent and scholarly modern Christianity.

"I find nothing in these writings of Dr. Workman which denies or eliminates the truly supernatural from Scripture or from prophecy. He recognizes and asserts the divine as well as the human in Scripture, and appears to be making an honest effort, by candid critical investigation of the facts, to determine the limits of each. The historical method of interpretation which he follows is now recognized as the only legitimate method by universal modern scholarship.

"In regard to the other topics enumerated by Dr. Workman, I judge that he mentions them as being matters of well-known discussion at the present day, and not as an expression of personal doubt as to the

essential doctrines of our Church on these questions. I find no indication that he calls in question the universality of guilt and depravity, or the necessity of the atoning work of Christ as the basis of the forgiveness of sin, or the proper eternity of future rewards and punishments. Unless we wish to make the Calvinistic doctrine of imputation and the popular conception of a material hell essential parts of these doctrines, I do not find that he is at all disposed to question them.

"I may state further that I have read the statements of Principal Grant, Professor Scrimger, and Professor Terry, and fully agree with them in their view of the relation of the subjects discussed to the principles of evangelical Christianity and to our Methodist doctrinal standards.

"N. BURWASH.

"Victoria University, Jan. 31st, 1899."

From each of these scholars I have also received a most appreciative testimony respecting "The Old Testament Vindicated," but it is scarcely necessary to produce them here, as two of them have been widely circulated already, and as the statements just submitted vindicate every feature of my teaching that has been called in question by my adverse critics. I ought to add, however, that in a previous communication, Professor Scrimger had described the general position taken in my lecture as "exegetically the correct one and, therefore, the only valid one for apologetic purposes," and that in the margin of the *Quarterly* which I gave him to read, opposite the sentence, "It should be said that Jesus of Nazareth is the *realized* rather than the *predicted* Christ of the Old Testament," Professor Terry has written with his pencil, "The entire discussion fairly establishes this proposition."

The foregoing testimonies are sufficient to show that my theory of prophecy is not negative, but positive; that my method of interpretation is not destructive, but constructive; that my view of the origin and development of Messianic prophecy is not naturalistic, but theistic; that my exposition of prophetic Scripture is not rationalistic, but evangelical: and that my treatment of the literature of the Bible is designed, not to undermine the truth, but to establish it. In everything I have written I have recognized the doctrines of supernatural inspiration and supernatural revelation, and in everything I have published I have tried to combat sceptical rationalism and to promote earnest evangelicism. My aim has always been the vindication of the truth as it is in Jesus.

In the preface to my book, I distinctly say, "Besides answering sceptical objections, I have shown the sense in which the Old Testament is an organic part of the New Testament; I have also shown the ethical and religious value of the ancient Scriptures in their inner spiritual relation to Christ and Christianity"; and, in the introduction to my lecture, I as distinctly say, "An endeavor will be made to reconsider the whole subject carefully and concisely in such a way as to rescue it from rationalistic treatment, on the one hand, and from irrational treatment, on the other hand, by applying the canons of sound Biblical interpretation to the historic character of prophecy, in order thereby to exhibit the true spiritual significance of those remarkable prophetic utterances in the Old Testament, whose underlying truths and principles find their embodiment in Jesus Christ."

IV.

APPEAL TO THE COMMITTEE.

HAVING vindicated the doctrinal soundness of my writings, I desire, before concluding this address, to refer briefly to the practical object of this investigation. According to the terms of the resolution which was passed by the Conference, I have asked to have my teaching investigated "with a view to justice to" myself "and to the satisfaction of the mind of the Church."

For the better understanding of the merits of my case, there are a few additional facts which I wish all our ministers and people to know. One thing which I would like them all to know is that, when it is stated that I was offered a position in the Arts faculty, but that I declined to accept it, the statement is incorrect. The Board offered to allow me to hold the place in the Arts faculty which I then held, only by taking from me the place in the Theological faculty which I also held; so that, while I could have stayed in the college, I could not have stayed there and retained my self-respect. To have consented to be deposed from the Chair for which I had specially qualified myself by a long course of post-graduate study, without a proper investigation, would have been to condemn myself before the whole country as an unsound teacher. Moreover, the professorship of Oriental Languages and Literature, which I was permitted to continue to

hold only by surrendering my professorship in Old Testament Exegesis and Literature, necessitated a consideration of the very subjects which the Board desired me not to discuss; for, to teach the Hebrew Bible to students in Arts, an instructor must employ the same method of interpretation that he employs in teaching the Hebrew Bible to students in Theology. Hence there was a moral principle involved in the Board's proposal. The limitation which it was proposed to place upon my work implied either unworthy evasion on my part or inadequate instruction to my classes; and I would no more condescend dishonorably to thwart the wishes of the Board than I would consent dishonestly to give unscientific teaching to my students. Therefore, even though I could have consistently surrendered my position in the Theological faculty, I could not conscientiously retain the position which I then held in the Arts faculty, and which the Regents offered conditionally to allow me still to hold.

Another thing which I would like our ministers and people to know is that, when it was reported, after my resignation, that my "teachings contravene the current belief of the Church regarding Messianic prophecy," the report was misleading; for, while my interpretation of Scripture is calculated to correct some current notions, which, however widely they may prevail, have never been sanctioned by the authority of the Church, it does not contravene the doctrinal standards of Methodism on a single point. Current beliefs, it should be observed, are often very imperfect, as well as very superficial; and one duty of a scientific teacher is to correct popular misconceptions, and thus to purify current beliefs. Without a measure of liberty the work of a competent university professor cannot be either faithfully or efficiently performed. In a Christian institution such liberty must be exercised, of course, within the limits of an

evangelical creed. Within those limits I have always conscientiously done my teaching, both in the lecture-room and out of it. Fifteen years ago next month I was elected by the Board of Regents to the Chair of Old Testament Exegesis and Literature in Victoria University, and granted leave of absence by them to qualify myself, at my own expense, for what I had every reason to expect would be my life work. After nearly five years of faithful preparation, on which all my available resources, physical and financial, were expended, I entered upon my duties in the spirit of a true minister of Christ, asking for myself only that freedom of thought and action which is accorded to my brethren in every other department of our Church work. In asking this, I do not think I asked too much.

There is still another thing which I would like our ministers and people to know, namely, that in all my teaching and preaching I have sought only the glory of God and the honor of Christ; and that in all my critical writing I have tried simply to get each part of the Bible understood in accordance with the thought of the person that wrote it, and the mind of the Spirit that inspired it. In my elucidation of Scripture my aim has always been the reconciliation of religious faith with scientific and historic truth. As faith results from the joint exercise of reason and conscience, it is intelligent in proportion as it knows the truth; but truth is discovered only by inquiry and investigation. Hence the critical study of the books of Scripture is no less necessary to the possession of an intelligent faith than is the critical study of the book of Nature. With the Bishops who attended the Lambeth Conference of 1897, I hold, therefore, that rational faith can be maintained in the Church only by the aid of reverent criticism. In their encyclical letter that year, the Bishops said, "The

critical study of the Bible by competent scholars is essential to the maintenance in the Church of a healthy faith. That faith is already in serious danger which refuses to face questions that may be raised either on the authority or the genuineness of any part of the Scriptures that have come down to us. Such refusal creates painful suspicion in the minds of many whom we have to teach, and will weaken the strength of our conviction of the truth that God has revealed to us. A faith which is always or often attended by a secret fear that we dare not inquire lest inquiry should lead us to results inconsistent with what we believe, is already infected with a disease which may soon destroy it."

The attitude for the Christian Church to take towards criticism should be one rather of sympathy and encouragement than of opposition and repression. This attitude was happily expressed in a recent number of *Zion's Herald*, Boston. Referring to a frank address, given a few weeks ago by Rev. S. P. Cadman, D.D., of New York, on the new scholarship in relation to the Bible, the editor of this able Methodist paper said, "It is useless, as it is insincere, to try to check this devout study of the Scriptures, or to brand it as something wrong. It will go on, for it is God's purpose that it go on. Out of it there will come a simpler, more inspiring, and more conquering faith. Let any man beware lest in this matter he be found fighting against God. Tolerance is the essence and spirit of Methodism. Wesley was the most tolerant of men. He discarded the old interpretation to make room for a clearer and better view. He was not afraid of truth, nor even of error, for he had undoubted faith that truth, in the clash of a living conflict, would conquer. Let the followers of Wesley to-day be as tolerant, as studious, as loyal to the truth as they find it, as he was. Let this friction over variant opinions in non-essentials cease."

And now, in closing, I ask the members of this Committee for a full investigation of my case, and a favorable report to the Conference. I have not taught heresy, nor was I dismissed from the University for teaching heresy; but the action of the Board in dismissing me made that impression on the country, so that ever since my resignation I have been under a cloud. When the controversy commenced, I had the confidence of the whole Church from the Atlantic to the Pacific; but for nearly nine years I have not had this confidence, and for over seven years I have not held an office, and for almost seven years I have not received a salary. I have done nothing worthy of death or of bonds, and yet for going on eight years I have been officially dead and professionally discredited. To lie under suspicion for so many years, without being able to get my case considered or my teaching investigated, has been a torturing experience.

Many persons have suggested that I ought to take a church, and I have sometimes been asked why I did not take a church; but there are three reasons why I have been left without an appointment, at my own request, for seven successive years. First, on physical grounds, I have been unable to discharge the duties of a pastorate. I have had most favorable offers of a church, both in Canada and the United States; but, owing to the unsatisfactory state of my health since the unfortunate loss of my arm, I have not felt that I could with safety undertake full pastoral work. Second, on professional grounds, I have been unwilling to discontinue my scientific study of the Scriptures. Having put my whole investment into the department of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, I have not felt that I should, in the circumstances, relinquish my critical and exegetical work. Third, on educational grounds, I have been disinclined to accept an

appointment to a pastoral charge. Having specially qualified myself for professorial work, and believing that I can serve the Church and help the truth to the best advantage in that work, I have not felt that I would, so long as I can keep from going too deeply into debt, engage in anything that might lessen my fitness for doing that work.

It will soon be seventeen years since I began to lecture to university students; and, in preparation for the Chair which was taken from me, I spent not only the best part of my patrimony, but also the best years of my life. Because of my qualifications for teaching, therefore, and my experience as a teacher, I have felt, and my friends have felt, that I ought to have a place in the Old Testament department of one of our educational institutions; and I have waited loyally from year to year in the hope, or rather in the faith, that, when the facts of my case were known and the character of my teaching was understood, the Church would restore me to my position in Victoria College.